

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [17th July 1953]

Bill to provide for the formation of the Andhra State is being discussed by the House, I should like to know at what stage the matter is."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member asked me this question and I requested him to refer the matter to the Hon. Minister in charge of Education. Instead, the Hon. Member is raising a point of order on the subject."

(Sri Pillalamarri Venkteswarlu rose to speak.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Hon. Members wishing to raise points of information may meet me in my Chambers before raising them on the Floor of the House, and have their doubts cleared. We shall now proceed to the next item on the agenda."

III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—cont.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I beg to move that—

'The proposed Andhra State Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration.'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

'That the proposed Andhra State Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration.'

"There are about 280 amendments. I wish to suggest an easy method by which we can go through all these amendments. The Long Title for instance has five amendments. I will ask the hon. Members who have given notice of amendments to the Long Title to move them formally. After they are moved and seconded, we can have a discussion on the clause as well as all the amendments. Then we can put them to vote one by one. It is not possible to discuss separately each of these 280 and odd amendments."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Our difficulty in accepting the suggestion is this. Of course in some cases we can accept your suggestion, Sir. But there are cases where amendments differ materially from one another."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will put one by one all the amendments to the vote of the House, and that will meet the objection."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"If it had been any other Bill I would have accepted the suggestion."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will give the hon. Members full scope for discussion."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Unless every amendment is discussed separately . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The voting on the amendments will be carried out separately."

17th July 1953]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ I want even the discussion on the amendments separately.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ In that case, the same arguments only will be repeated.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—“ I was surprised at the academical proposal made by Sri Venkateswarlu. When a single subject is covered by a number of amendments, necessarily the discussion will cover all the amendments relating to that subject. There is no object in dialectic isolation of one amendment from another. It is better that the amendments are moved as the Hon. Speaker has suggested and that discussion takes place on the comparative merits of the amendments, and then the result taken separately.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ To an extent, what you say, Sir, is all right. But when we come to schedules . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ For schedules we can adopt a different method.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM** :—“ If two clauses which may either be inter-connected or which may relate to different matters . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am going to take up the Bill only clause by clause.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I understood the Hon. Speaker to say that the clauses will be taken up separately for discussion.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ I would like to submit, Sir, that every amendment should be taken by itself. Then there is the advantage of discussing and voting upon specific amendments and thereby a lot of time will be saved. Had it been any other Bill, we would have accepted your suggestion. But here there are difficulties. This is a most important Bill and that is why the procedure which we used to follow previously may be changed this time.” 10-40 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Wherever there is difficulty, let the hon. Member inform me.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I request that clause 2 may be taken up first and the Long Title and clause 1 may be taken up at the end.”

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are no amendments to clause 2. I pass on to clause 3.”

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ On a point of order, Sir. What happened to the privilege motion of which I gave notice yesterday? ”

[17th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan has given notice of a motion and not yourself."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"I also gave notice of a privilege motion yesterday in the morning."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Hundreds of motions are being given to me daily in my room. Anyhow, I will look into my file."

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI:—"On a point of order, Sir. I want to know whether all the amendments would be put for voting. There are some amendments which affect the interests of Kannada. If the total number of votes on any issue is going to be the deciding factor, I would like to point out that the Kannada people are absolutely in a minority in this House and all such differences must be very carefully looked into by the Parliament."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"With reference to the statement of the hon. Member coming from South Kanara, I would like to make it clear. Sir, with regard to the procedure of this House nothing is going to depend upon numbers in a matter of this kind. Certainly the Members representing the Kannada area are in a minority and it may be the same with reference to other matters in a different way. Nothing will depend upon numbers. That is why the entire proceedings are going to the Parliament and they will exactly say where the division has taken place, why it has taken place and in what manner it has taken place. So we need not have any anxiety about numbers in these matters."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMAINAM:—"Clauses 3 and 4 relate to territories which would form the Andhra State and the territory which should be tacked on to the Mysore State. Only after these clauses are disposed of, the Government amendment relating to the appointment of a Boundary Commission will come up. So I suggest that we may take up clause 3 now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall now take up the amendment relating to the headline to Part II. The hon. Member Sri D. Krishnamurthy will move his amendment."

Head line to Part II.

* SRI D. KRISHNAMURTHY GOUNDER:—" (9) Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely,—

'After the words, "Formation of Andhra State" insert the words "Tamil State".'

"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே. இந்தத் திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்ததின் நோக்கம் என்னவென்றால், ஆந்திர மாகாணம் அமைப்பதோடு மாத்திரம் இருந்துவிடாது உடனேயே தமிழ் மாகாணத்தையும் அமைக்கவேண்டுமென்பதுதான். அதற்காகத்தான் ஆந்திர மாகாணம் பிரிந்தவடன் பாக்கி யிருப்பதை சென்னை மாகாணம் என்று சொல்லாமல் தமிழ் மாகாணம் என்று அமைக்கவேண்டுமென்பதற்காகவே இந்தத் திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். இதை ஆதரிக்கவேண்டும்."

17th July 1953]

SRI M. PALANIANDI:—“ Sir, I second the amendment.”

The following amendments were then moved by the Members in whose names they were standing and duly seconded:—

Clause 3.

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—

10 “ This House resolves that for clause 3 (1), the following shall be substituted:—

‘ 3. *Formation of Andhra State.*—(1) Subject to section 4, as from the appointed day, there shall be formed a Part A State to be known as the State of Andhra comprising the territories which immediately before that day were comprised in Srikakulam, Visakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna Guntur, Nellore, Kurnool, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Chittoor districts and in the Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg taluks and the firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi of Bellary district in the State of Madras and the said territories shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of Madras.’ ”

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—

11 “ This House recommends that provision be made for the deletion of the words ‘ and in the Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg taluks of Bellary district ’ and for the insertion of the words ‘ and Bellary ’ between the words ‘ Chittoor ’ and ‘ districts ’ in clause 3 and for the deletion of clause 4. ”

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—

12 In sub-clause (1), after the word “ taluks ” occurring in the seventh line, insert the words “ and Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi firkas of Bellary taluk ”.

SRI M. RAJESWARRA RAO:—

13 After the words “ Alur, Adoni ”, delete the word “ and ” and substitute the words “ Moka, Rupanagudi and Bellary firkas of Bellary taluk ” after the word “ Rayadurg ”.

SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA:—

14 Omit the words “ and in the Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg taluks of Bellary district in the State of Madras ” occurring in lines 6 and 7 of sub-clause (1).

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—

16 Add after “ Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg taluks ”, the following:—

“ Moka Rupanagudi, Bellary firkas including Bellary town in Bellary taluk in Bellary district and Gudiyatham taluk in North Arcot district and Hosur and Krishnagiri taluks in Salem district in Madras State; Kolar, Bangalore, Chitaldrug and Tumkur in Mysore State; Hyderabad, Mahaboobnagar, Adilabad, Nizamabad, Medak, Karimnagar, Warangal, Nalagonda districts and

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [17th July 1953]

Tanalur taluk in Osmanabad district and Gadwal and Alampur taluk in Raichur district in Hyderabad State; Bastar, Chanda districts in Madhya Pradesh State, Kuroput district and Berhampur, Parlakimedi, Ganjam taluk in Ganjam district, Orissa State."

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA:—

17 In line 7, *after* the words "Rayadrug taluks of Bellary district", *insert* the following words:—

"Bellary town and Bellary rural along with five villages in Bellary firka, namely,—

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| (1) Andrahalu | (4) Bisalalli |
| (2) Alakundi | (5) Minchari |
| (3) B. Goullu | |

and seventeen villages in Moka firka, namely,—

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| (1) Moka | (10) Bommanahal |
| (2) Eragudi | (11) B. Naganahalli |
| (3) B. D. Halli | (12) Sankanakal |
| (4) Chaganur | (13) Balichinta |
| (5) Tambaralli | (14) G.M. Halli |
| (6) Mallapuram | (15) Karekal |
| (7) M. Gonal | (16) Veerapuram |
| (8) Jalihal | (17) Sindavalam |
| (9) Benekal | |

and nineteen villages of Rupanagudi firka of Bellary district."

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM:—

18 In clause 3, *after* the words "Chittoor districts", *insert* the words "except Tiruttani, Vallaraneri (Palamaneri), Kanquenthikuppam, Puthur, Sankaragiri (Tirupathi) and Chittoor taluks in that district".

SRI E. L. RAGHAVA MUDALIAR:—

20 In sub-clause (1), *after* the words "Chittoor districts", *insert* the words "excluding the taluks of Kuppam, Chittoor, Puthur, Punganur, Kalahasti and Tiruttani".

New proviso.

10-50
a.m.

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—

• 21 *Add* the following proviso to clause 3, sub-clause (1):—

"Provided that the Government of India do take necessary steps to finally settle the boundaries of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore, Orissa, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh States, either by mutual agreement between the States concerned or by a Boundary Commission or Commissions and that the districts concerned may thereupon be reformed accordingly."

17th July 1953]

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—

25 *Add* the following at the end of sub-clause (1):—

“ Provided that such predominantly Tamil-speaking areas of Chittoor district as may be so determined by any Boundary Commission to be set up by the Union Government shall merge back into the Residuary State of Madras as and from the date fixed therefor by the relevant authorities.”

Sub-clause (2).

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—

26 “ This House resolves that in clause 3 (2), after the words ‘ taluk of Rayadrug ’, the words ‘ and the said firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi ’ shall be inserted.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—

27 *For* the existing sub-clause, *substitute* the following:—

“ (2) Without prejudice to the power of the State Government to alter hereafter the extent and boundaries of districts, the said taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug and the three firkas of Moka, Rupanagudi and Bellary of Bellary taluk and the taluks of Dhone and Pattikonda of Kurnool district and the taluks of Kalyandrug and Gooty of Anantapur district shall be amalgamated and become a new district known as Bellary district.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—

28 “ This House recommends that sub-clause (2) be deleted.”

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA:—

30 In sub-clause (2), *after* the words “ Anantapur district,” *insert* the following words:—

“ and Bellary town and five villages in Bellary firka and seventeen villages in Moka firka and nineteen villages in Rupanagudi firka shall be added to Kurnool district.”

New sub-clause (3).

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—

31 “ This House resolves that after clause 3 (2), the following shall be added:—

“ (3) As soon as may be after the appointed day the President shall appoint a Boundary Commission to demarcate the Telugu-speaking areas in the districts of Chingleput, North Arcot and Salem in the State of Madras and in the districts of Kolar, Tumkur, Chitaldrug and Bangalore in the State of Mysore which are contiguous to the Andhra State and on such demarcation the areas so demarcated shall form part of the State of Andhra.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—

32 *Add* at the end the following:—

“ (3) Boundary Commissions be set up on or within one month after the appointed day to re-demarcate the boundary

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [17th July 1953]

between the States of Mysore and Andhra, especially the disputed areas in Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg taluks, Anantapur, Bellary, Tumkur, Kolar and Bangalore districts, and also the boundary between the States of Madras and Andhra, especially the disputed areas in Chingleput, North Arcot, Salem and Chittoor districts, the basis for such demarcation being the language and contiguity taking the village as the lowest unit for the purpose of such demarcation."

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—

33 " This Assembly recommends that in clause 3, the following sub-clause (3) may be added :—

(3) The three firkas of Bellary, namely, Moka, Rupana-gudi and Bellary including Bellary town shall remain in the Residuary State of Madras pending the results of a plebiscite to decide to which State (Andhra or Mysore) the people is to be attached, and the deficit, if any, resulting from the administration of these firkas shall be borne by the Andhra State."

General.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—

34 " This House recommends to the Parliament of India that clause 2 of the Andhra State Bill, 1953, be amended by adding a section after sub-section (1) which will provide for the appointment of a Boundary Commission within six months of the appointed day which shall go into the question of demarcation of the boundaries between the Madras and Andhra States on the basis of the following principle :—

' If an area is contiguous to a State and contains a population the majority of whom speak the language of the State that area shall form part of that State. In implementing this principle the villages shall be the units for the purpose of determining their areas which are to join this or that State.' "

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—

35 " That Boundary Commissions be set up on the appointed day or within one month after, to enquire into the border disputes between the Andhra State and Mysore State on the one hand and the Andhra State and the Residuary Madras State on the other and adjust the present boundaries of the abovementioned States on the basis of language, and contiguity villagewar."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—

36 Add the following at the end :—

" That Boundary Commissions be set up on or within one month after the appointed day to re-demarcate the boundaries between the States of Mysore and Andhra on the one hand and Madras and Andhra on the other on the basis of language and contiguity with village as basis."

17th July 1953]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—

37 “ That the Boundary Commission set up to determine the boundary between Mysore and Andhra States decide the question of including the bi-lingual area of Rupanagudi, Moka and Bellary firkas in either State, by means of a plebiscite.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—

38 “ Whereas the district of Chittoor has been considered as an undisputed Telugu district for purposes of formation of the Andhra State and whereas disputes have been raised by the Tamilians living in the Tamilian territories of the district, this House recommends that a Boundary Commission be appointed to examine the claims of the Tamilians and that the decision of such Commission be given effect to before the 31st December 1953.”

SRI K. VENKATIAH:—

39 “ This Legislative Assembly resolves to request the Government of India for the constitution of two Boundary Commissions to demarcate the exact boundaries between the Andhra and the Mysore States on the one hand and the Andhra and the Madras States on the other after careful consideration of the language of the people and the contiguity of the area populated with people speaking the same language, taking the village as basic unit and thus revise and also to request to amend the Andhra State Bill providing for such boundary adjustments.”

SRI L. LAKSHMAN DAS:—

41 “ This House recommends to the Government of India to make a provision in the Bill for the early appointment of a Boundary Commission to determine all Telugu-speaking areas of Parlakimedi, Berhampore, Gunupur and Jeypore of Orissa State and Bustar of Madhya Pradesh State which are on the northern boundaries of the Andhra State.”

SRI K. RAMAIAH CHAUDARY:—

42 Add the following sub-clause to sub-clause (2):—

“(2-a) After completion of the formation of Andhra State, Bellary firka, Bellary town, Moka, Rupanagudi firkas be added to the Andhra State.”

SRI G. YALLAMANDA REDDI:—

43 Add at the end of sub-clause (2), the following:—

“ A Boundary Commission shall be appointed by the President to re-demarcate exact boundaries between Andhra and Madras and between Andhra and Mysore on the basis of language and contiguity with the village as the basic unit.”

[17th July 1953]

SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—

44 Add as sub-clause (3), the following :—

“(3) All disputes among the States of Madras, Andhra and Mysore regarding the inclusion of a part of a district or territory in any one of the said States shall be referred to a Boundary Commission appointed for the purpose.”

11
a.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I would like to mention a few words in modification of what my colleague said previously about the order of business in this connexion. After listening to the amendments that have been moved, it seems that we cannot separate the Government amendment referred to during the discussion. The amendment that is proposed to be moved by the Government reads as follows :—

(55-A.) ‘ A clause should be included in this part of the Bill to the effect that, as soon as possible after the formation of the Andhra State, the President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiring into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas, and for making recommendations as to any adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundary of the Andhra State in those areas.’

I think that this could be properly discussed along with the other amendments.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Amendments to clause 3 have been moved and hon. Members may move their amendments to clause 4 also. The Government amendment is common to both clause 3 and clause 4. That is why I think it will be better if we take up clause 4 also for discussion. That will be the proper way of doing things. Now, Mr. Varadachari may move his amendment to clause 4.”

Clause 4.

The following amendments were then moved by the Members in whose names they were standing and duly seconded :—

Sub-clause (1).

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—

45 “ This House resolves that for clause 4 (1), the following shall be substituted :—

‘ 4. *Transfer of territory from Madras to Mysore.*—
(1) As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Mysore the territory which immediately before that day was comprised in the Bellary district other than the taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug and the firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi in the State of Madras and the said territory shall thereupon cease to form part of the State of Madras.’ ”

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—

46 “ Resolved that for sub-clause (1), the following shall be substituted :—

‘ (1) As from the appointed day there shall be added to the State of Mysore the territory which immediately before that day

17th July 1953]

was comprised in the Bellary district other than the taluks of Alur, Adoni, Rayadrug and the firkas of Bellary, Moka, Rupanagudi in the State of Madras.

The President may, however, before the appointed day hold a plebiscite to elicit the opinion of the people of the firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi as to whether they desire those areas to be included in the Andhra State or the Mysore State and the President may carry out the wish of the majority of the people to affiliate the said areas or any part of the same to the Andhra State or the Mysore State, as the case may be.' "

Substitution by new clause.

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—

47 " This House recommends that a new clause be added in place of clause 4, providing for the appointment, as soon as may be, of Boundary Commissions to decide the Telugu-speaking areas in the Residuary State of Madras which are contiguous to the Andhra State, such as those in the districts of Salem, North Arcot and Chingleput, and for the transferring of such areas to the Andhra State by order of the President."

New clause 4-A.

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—

48 " This House resolves that after clause 4, the following shall be inserted:—

' 4-A. As soon as may be before the appointed day, the President shall by plebiscite ascertain the opinion of the people in the firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi in the Bellary district in regard to the inclusion of the said firkas either in the State of Andhra or in the State of Mysore and in accordance with the wish of the majority of the people in those firkas ascertained by such plebiscite include the said firkas either in the State of Andhra or in the State of Mysore as the case may be.' "

Sub-clause (1).

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—

50 *After* the word " Rayadrug " *insert* the words " and Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi firkas of Bellary taluk ".

SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA:—

51 In line 4 of sub-clause (1), *for* the words " taluks of Bellary district other than Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug ", *substitute* the words " district of Bellary ".

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—

52 *For* the words " and Rayadrug ", *substitute* the words " Rayadrug taluk and Bellary, Rupanagudi, Moka firkas in Bellary taluk " and runs as in the State of Madras.

[17th July 1953]

Sub-clause (2).

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—

53 For the word “Bellary” occurring in the third line, *substitute* the word “Hospet”.

Insertion of new provision.

SRI PRAGADA KOTAI AH :—

54 “This House recommends to the Union Government to make a provision under clause 4 of this Bill for the appointment of a Boundary Commission to determine the disputed areas as between the States of Madras, Mysore and Andhra.”

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—

55 “This House recommends that for the words “the territory which immediately . . . State of Madras”, the words “all the Kannada-speaking area comprised in the State of Madras, viz., Bellary district, South Kanara district, Nilgiris district, Kollegal taluk of Coimbatore district, Madakasira taluk and other few villages of Anantapur districts, Hosur taluk and other few villages of Salem district, etc.,” shall be substituted.

MR. SPEAKER :—“The Government will now be perfectly in order in moving their amendment. The Hon. Minister may move his amendment under Part II.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Sir, I move the following amendment standing in my name, to Part II of the Bill :—

‘55-A “A clause should be included in this Part of the Bill to the effect that, as soon as possible after the formation of the Andhra State, the President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiring into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas, and for making recommendations as to any adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundary of the Andhra State in those areas.”’

MR. SPEAKER :—“Now there will be a discussion on all the amendments that have been moved.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“I wish to bring to your notice, Sir, that I have also given notice of an amendment the serial number of which is 260. It also refers to the question of the appointment of a Boundary Commission. May I move that amendment also now ?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“If the Government amendment on this subject is accepted, the hon. Member need not move his amendment. Anyway his amendment must have come here. There is a place for each amendment.”

11-10 a.m. SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“It is not a question of printing. It should have been put in the proper place. The hon. Member has not given the order for printing.” (Laughter.)

17th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"He has given notice of the amendment for the introduction of a new paragraph, paragraph 20. So it can come only after 19."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Latchanna must know that the House having taken up the present amendment, he need not move his."

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—"Sir, there is nothing in common between my amendment and the Government amendment because my amendment makes mention about 'all the Kannada-speaking area comprised in the State of Madras, viz, Bellary district, South Kanara district, Nilgiris district, Kollegal taluk of Coimbatore district, Madakasira taluk and other few villages of Anantapur district, Hosur taluk and other few villages of Salem district, etc.' With regard to disputed areas, I do not object to the Government amendment. But these are not disputed areas. They are entirely Kannada areas."

*** SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—"Sir, we have no objection to the Government amendment. We are willing to accept it but I think some time should be given to us to consider it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member can speak now."

*** SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—"Not that I want to speak now. Let us be given some time to consider the amendment."

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—"Sir, I believe we are now in discussion on all these amendments which have been moved and it may perhaps be helpful if I make just a few remarks in support of the Government amendment in relation to the many other amendments that have been moved. Of course, those amendments which have been moved by several hon. Members in order to cover a very wide field—such as Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Hyderabad and the like—fall in a different category and I believe that the House may have to give an opinion on that aspect of the matter separately. If the amendments are really intended to cover ground much larger than the Government amendment covers, surely that has to be considered separately and the only remark that I would like to make on that is whether it is worthwhile that this House should load the proceedings with an opinion on that subject, especially when we see nothing depends on our own decision but on a decision in Parliament where there will again be a full discussion on general principles of that kind. With regard to contiguous areas, the question arises whether we should deal also with places like Mysore as was last indicated. I say that this is another type of amendment. The present Bill is for the creation of an Andhra State and not for the general redistribution of all the States in India. This is with reference to Andhra alone and, therefore, it may not be proper for this House to send its opinions and views in respect of contiguous areas in that connection. To try to enlarge or decrease the area of the Mysore State and to hand over Kannada areas from the residuary State which is not contiguous to Mysore, or to give over Tamil areas in Mysore to the residuary State would not be within the scope of the present Bill."

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [17th July 1953]

I think it would be unnecessarily burdening the proceedings of the House if we suggest anything on that point. It will not be covered by the discussion in the Parliament over this Bill. They will definitely rule out any general redistribution plan from the consideration of this Bill. Therefore, I submit that hon. Members who have moved large scope amendments may express their views but it would not be necessary to vote on these matters. It will help only to confuse matters rather than help to solve the problem. By narrowing down the discussion, we can help quick approval of the Bill, as the Government amendment, for all practical purposes, will cover every aspect of the matter.

“Sir, I have already explained in the course of the general discussion the legal position. A boundary commission, even if appointed in pursuance of our opinion, can only be appointed by the Government of India to enquire into border disputes. No statutory authority is necessary from Parliament for that purpose. And even if a boundary commission is appointed, the recommendations it makes, will have to come in the shape of a Bill before the Parliament which will have to consider it. Simply because we appoint a boundary commission under the present Bill, it cannot by itself conclude the matter. So, the Government of India rightly feel that a discussion on boundary commissions is unnecessary. But so far as this Government are concerned, we felt that in order to ease the situation in respect of the many disputes that have arisen, it was better to remove from the public mind any doubts with regard to that matter. We have reiterated our opinion that a boundary commission should be appointed to dispose of these disputed matters. Now the words that go to make up the Government amendment are general and broad and leave much room for the Government of India to dispose of matters under dispute from every point of view. Therefore, I commend that in spite of particular amendments moved by various Members, if the Government amendment is accepted unanimously, it will have much greater force than if we proceed to divide among ourselves over small villages, firkas and the like. After all, we are agreed on the question of boundary commission. Particularisation of matters in amending motions does not really solve anything. We depend ultimately on the boundary commission and if that boundary commission has the authority and if its terms of reference are sufficient to cover all the matters referred to in the various amendments, then the Government amendment should be enough. With these words, Sir, I commend the Government amendment to the close consideration of those Members who have moved other amendments.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“Sir, the Chief Minister has explained the scope of the Government amendment, but my doubt is whether that covers all the Telugu-speaking Tamil areas and Tamil-speaking Telugu areas, and also the several propositions made about the Mysore State.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I have already stated that it will not. It is not our intention to cover

17th July 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

them and it will not cover. I have made it quite clear just now that these amendments which seek to cover a much larger ground will not be covered by the Government amendment, but all the particular amendments as to taluks, firkas and the like. So, we may express our opinion if we desire separately on the wider scope amendments. I am only referring to those amendments which are really covered by the general amendment moved by the Government and they need not be pressed. With regard to Visala Andhra and other matters, they may be dealt with separately. I have expressed my opinion with all deference to the House that it really is purposeless to cover so much ground. We are likely to win a battle if we cover definite ground but we will not get any kind of gain by covering all ground unnecessarily."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know what the Government have in view with regard to certain border areas?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Certain border areas where disputes have arisen? Cannot the hon. Member realise that it is much better to leave these as they are without further clarification?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am suggesting that further clarification is necessary in view of certain statements or pronouncements made by certain people recently. We would like to know whether all disputes including the Bellary dispute are covered by that phrase."

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—"I wonder if the hon. Member was absent at the time I spoke. I made it quite clear yesterday that the Government of India having expressed a certain view about Bellary and since one wants Parliament to take into account the dispute about the Bellary district also as was pointed out by Mr. Prakasam, it would be better if the terms are left loose and general so that the Government of India may reconsider the situation. But if we, so to say, take the bull by the horns, it may not be good strategy."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is not good strategy. But I want to know what the Government have in view."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Our view is not relevant. I have said that our proposals go only as recommendations for the Bill to be discussed by the Parliament. Bellary has been disposed of by the Government of India in a certain way. Now there are certain disputes arising—it may be admitted quite frankly—in both Bellary and in Chittoor areas. Need we go further than what the Government amendment has done in order to bring them within the terms of reference of the boundary commission? Let us remember that a statutory provision by way of a clause or sub-clause is not necessary in the Bill before us. We may leave the question to the boundary commission which is to be appointed. The Government will have full scope to include any subject in the terms of reference. Further clarification will be prejudicial and we should not try to forestall that matter."

[17th July 1953]

11-20 a.m. SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"Sir, as I pointed out yesterday, this Bill may be confined to the subject direct. But Mr. Rajagopalachari, the Chief Minister, says that Bellary has been decided. I pointed out that the question of Bellary was not decided and should not be considered as decided. Therefore, it will be the duty of every one of us to make it clear that so far as Bellary is concerned, it cannot become a subject for decision even in Parliament so as to assign it away to the Mysore State on a report or opinion of Justice Misra. So far as the Government amendment is concerned, it is general no doubt. I should have no quarrel with the wording, speaking generally. All friends have taken a broader view and have put before this House questions like Andhra, Visala Andhra, etc. For the first time, Sir, I am very pleased to note that all these things have been brought before you in connection with this Bill, whether they particularly pertain to this Bill or not. My own view is that all those things might be discussed here and may be placed before this House, so that Parliament which is supposed to be in charge of this matter might take into account the whole situation. Therefore, my friend Mr. Viswanatham has been trying to get a definite statement from the Chief Minister Mr. Rajagopalachari. But he is too difficult a man to commit himself to any position, and no reply has been given."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I was only advising in the best interests of the very object which is put forward by Sri Prakasam, Sri Viswanatham and others. Let me point out again and request hon. Members to concentrate on the words used in the Government amendment. The words used in the amendment are—

... shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiring into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas ...

The rest are consequential. There is no question of committal or non-committal. Wherever, in connection with certain border areas, disputes have arisen, this amendment will cover them. It is open to hon. Members like Sri Prakasam, Sri Viswanatham and others to say definitely we are all going to vote for this amendment taking it for granted that Bellary is disputed or comes under this clause. More than this is unnecessary. This is what I say. After all, when we express a common and unanimous opinion and send it for consideration by Parliament, that opinion would have a greater effect than what a definite amendment including the Bellary question and, so to say, trying straightway to dispute the decision reached by the Government of India, would have. If we present the Government amendment with a common vote and clearly explaining that Bellary is included by Sri Prakasam and others, the Government of India will have to dispose of that matter one way or the other clearly in the background of all that has happened here. There is no question of my being a difficult man. (Laughter.) The subject is difficult. I have made it as easy as possible."

(Sri T. Prakasam was standing in his place to speak.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Please accept my advice,"

17th July 1953]

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ I have been thinking of accepting your (the Chief Minister's) advice. It is a thing that has gone wrong. It must be set right. It is a wrong on the part of the Government of India to say that the Bellary question had been decided by Misra or by the Government of India. The Government of India are bound to do their duty properly. That is why I say that so far as Bellary is concerned, it cannot be disposed of even by the Government of India. Until finally the Bill is taken up in Parliament, the Government of India cannot dispose of Bellary and say, ‘ this must go to Mysore State ’. Mysore State cannot come in here at this stage. Andhra is going to be a State very soon. As between State and State there are so many things that have to be settled. They must come in a formal manner. Those things have not come up till now. ‘ Added to the Mysore State ’, how it came, nobody knows. Whether it is assignment of properties of Bellary . . . ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ No property.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Not only properties, but men, cattle and everything has been assigned by the Government of India. That is the way how the Government of India are thinking of respecting the rights of the people over whom they are called upon to govern.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Is it not better to send a unanimous opinion? ”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ A unanimous opinion will certainly help, and in the light of the explanations given on behalf of the Government by the Chief Minister, a unanimous opinion on this matter would be helpful. When I pointed out yesterday that for one hundred years the revenue accounts of Bellary were kept in Telugu, and that the whole administration was carried on in Telugu, Mr. Nagan Gouda got up to say that an injustice was done. But the whole mischief had been done for one hundred years before this Nagan Gouda was born or before his ancestors were born. Therefore, on this Bellary issue, it is not a question of a Boundary Commission. The people are particular of having a plebiscite. Plebiscite is a different thing from a Boundary Commission. Therefore, I submit that this amendment of the Government might be accepted by us in the interests of all parties, making special allowance for other subjects that have been placed before this House, particularly Visala Andhra, Hyderabad, and various other points that have been brought forward. I am very glad that all these things have come up now.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ On a point of order, Sir. Is the discussion going to be carried on between two Members or will every one of us here will get a chance to take part in the discussion.” 11-30 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is no conversation. Every Member will get a chance.”

[17th July 1953]

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ May I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to clarify the meaning of the words in the Government amendment, namely, . . . for enquiring into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas ’. Does this mean only some few cases of border areas which are under dispute or all border areas where there are disputes? ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ They mean that the Boundary Commission can only go through the disputes in the two areas where there have been disputes raised. It does not cover the rest.”

(The hon. Member Sri Latchanna stood up in his seat.)

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ While his mike is not working let me inform the hon. Member that because it does not cover all the disputes, a decision on this will not cover other places and a decision may be given by this House on amendments covering them.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ So, may I take it that according to the view of the Government, a dispute exists only where law-breaking agitation is carried on and not in other places where the agitation is going on for many years in a constitutional manner. Is it so? ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I congratulate the hon. Member, Sir, for putting the case in this very clear manner. Let me answer him. It is not right for us to say that only unlawful agitation and unlawful forms of agitation are recognized by us as disputes. Therefore the words ‘ unlawful agitation ’ are not there. I do not understand the expression ‘ linguistic disputes going on in other places ’. How could disputes have been going on before the Bill was thought of or was brought into being. The dispute with reference to formation of States on linguistic basis was there but as to other areas, I do not know what places the hon. Member referred to when he said ‘ other places where there have been lawful forms of agitation ’.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ I am thankful to the Hon. the Chief Minister for having given me a chance to make my point clear. I meant areas where there are disputes ever since the formation of Orissa. Agitation is still being continued there. There is also the assurance by the All-India Congress Committee in this regard. Also in Madhya Pradesh . . . ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Have I not made it quite clear? I think the hon. Member is really out of order. The matter has been made quite clear that this Bill refers only, can only refer and deal only with those areas. Orissa and others we cannot bring into this Bill at all.”

* SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA :—“ Sir, I would like to make it quite clear that the dispute over Bellary has already been decided by the award. I have also heard the Hon. Chief Minister making remarks that the Bellary question was quite different. I wish to

17th July 1953]

[Sri Ijari Sirasappa]

make it clear that the Bellary question has already been decided and the question of Chittoor alone has to be decided later on by a Boundary Commission. In this connexion, I would like to know the opinion of the Hon. the Chief Minister regarding the opinions put forth by the Andhra Members. Some say a plebiscite should be taken. Others say that a Boundary Commission should go into the question. Does this mean that a Boundary Commission will be asked for after the plebiscite fails or a plebiscite would be demanded if the findings of the Boundary Commission goes against them? Let them be clear in their demand. I repeat there is no dispute over Bellary taluk. The dispute is only regarding the three taluks, Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug. That question can be referred to the Boundary Commission."

(Some hon. Members stood up in their seats.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have allotted five minutes to each hon. Member. Let them express their views and then let the Hon. the Chief Minister answer all the points raised. I think that procedure would be much better."

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"On a point of information, Sir. The suggestion of the Hon. Speaker was that each hon. Member will be given an opportunity to speak on the amendments moved by them and after the Members have spoken, the Hon. the Chief Minister would reply and then the amendments would be put to vote. I submit, that this question being a very important one, it is better that Members express their views quite dispassionately and clearly. Within the time of five minutes allotted to each hon. Member it will be difficult to do this. The time allowed is quite insufficient."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"The amendment given notice of by the Government is a very important one. We want, no doubt, clarification from the Hon. the Chief Minister on the amendment. But at the same time after giving hon. Members five minutes time to speak on the amendment and after the reply of the Hon. Minister, if the amendments are put to vote, a grave injustice would be done because we cannot have sufficient discussion on the amendments in the course of clarification of doubts. Sufficient time must be allotted and a discussion allowed to take place before the amendments are put to vote and the Government amendment should not be put to vote before other amendments are discussed."

MR. SPEAKER:—"That is what I am going to do. After giving every member an opportunity to speak, each amendment would be put to vote."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I rise so often, Sir, because hon. Members ask so often for clarification from me. Otherwise I do not wish to divert the course of the discussion as proposed by you. The only point I want to make quite clear to hon. Member Sri Sirasappa is this. He was referring to my previous statement that the two disputes were different. The point was raised that the Government did not act impartially

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [17th July 1953]

as between the two areas, and I explained the difference between the two areas in that connexion. So far as the border disputes and the Boundary Commission are concerned, those remarks do not apply. Enough discussion has taken place now on this. There was a distinction between Bellary and Chittoor in respect of the particular matter, I referred to, and therefore Government had to follow a particular line. But a Boundary Commission will go into the matter if this Government amendment is accepted by the House and accepted by the Government of India also.

"Then, Sir, about the other question of plebiscite, let us remember that a Boundary Commission is to enquire and the method by which the Boundary Commission will get the results may be anything, it may be by enquiry, it may be by plebiscite or with statistics. That must be left open. There is no object in introducing in the Andhra Bill to be passed by Parliament a particular plebiscite to be taken in a particular area. It is generally a kind of form followed in international matters. I do not know whether hon. Members agree with me. My own belief is that a new State will have very little chance for orderly progress if it begins with plebiscites in the areas which fall into the new State."

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—"Sir, the question has been considered in detail and two High Court Judges were appointed to go into the matter and findings were given by them. The Government of India gave their decision based on the findings of these judges. Therefore it is not now open to this House to re-open the question of Bellary. If the decision already arrived at by the Government of India were to be rejected and the question of Bellary were re-opened and the House called upon to go into it and give its own decision, it would create disruption and chaos in the Bellary taluk. The Hon. Justice Misra did not find it convenient to visit the disputed areas like Rupanagudi and some other villages and obtain the opinion of the villagers on account of the demonstrations which were made near his quarters. He had an open mind and really did feel that he should visit the disputed areas and find out the trend of public opinion in those villages and then give his findings. But he was prevented from doing so on account of the demonstrations made when he was about to leave for those villages. Therefore, it is not within the perview of this House or within the terms of reference to this Government given by the Government of India that we should arrive at a decision on Bellary taluk. The question has already been decided and therefore this Government or this House cannot re-open the subject which is not covered by the terms referred to by the India Government.

11-40 a.m. "As for the plebiscite, Sir, if the plebiscite is to be taken . . ."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"On a point of order, Sir. May I know whether the Speaker has allowed any discussion and has Mr. Siddanna Gowd been given an opportunity to speak on the subject?"

17th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Yes, I have given him an opportunity to speak on the subject."

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—"The atmosphere in the Bellary firka is surcharged with great heat and acerbity and when that is the atmosphere, if the people are called upon to exercise their opinion, their free opinion, it will lead to further disturbance and chaos. Therefore, I am opposed to a plebiscite being taken now. Therefore the figures of 1951 census should be taken into account and hon. Members who oppose the inclusion of Bellary firka to Mysore State cannot say that the figures of 1951 census are incorrect and erroneous. They take the census figures as correct when they suit them and when they do not suit them, they characterise the census figures as false and erroneous. It is not open either to re-open the subject on the basis of falsity of census figures furnished by the Madras State to the India Government, or it is possible under the circumstances to take a plebiscite in Bellary firka. Therefore, I once again appeal to the members who oppose the inclusion of Bellary firka to Mysore not to re-open the subject and to consider it as decided once for all, in the interests of unity and harmony and good feeling that ought to subsist between two neighbouring States."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"I hope, Sir, that you had promised earlier that every opportunity would be given for getting a clarification from the Hon. the Chief Minister."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"We required a clarification and on that only this has started. Sir, you have converted it into a discussion. I have no objection, if some clarification is coming from the Hon. the Chief Minister."

MR. SPEAKER:—"We will have discussion on all the amendments."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"Then, I rise to oppose the amendment suggested by the Government. If the Hon. the Chief Minister clarifies the position further, then we will reconsider."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know, Sir, whether we are taking up Government amendments separately?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, we are taking all the amendments together and we will have discussion on all the amendments including Government amendments. Mr. Hanumantha Rao will speak now."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"The position at present is like this. Many of us have given amendments, of course covering the whole border areas around the Andhra State. The amendment sought to be moved by the Government narrows down the position. Here, the suggestion that was made by the Hon. Chief Minister was that fresh problems need not be taken up now; a general consideration would be there later when it is decided by the All-India Government and so let us confine ourselves to the

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [17th July 1953]

present border disputes that arise out of the demarcation to be made on 1st October. But even here I am afraid that the amendment moved by the Government will curtail us from putting forward a claim over Kolar district and some other places which are now in different other States and not in the Andhra State. The problem is that when the Andhra State is formed the Madakasira taluk would be a disputed area. Generally, it is claimed that Karnatakas happen to be the majority in Madakasira taluk. But at the same time the Andhra State or the Andhras in general will not be in a position to put forward their claims that Kolar district which is a Telugu district must be brought into the Andhra State, if we do not make particular mention of the Mysore State here in the Government amendment. So, Sir, the scope here is restricted much more than necessary, even if we leave the problem of creating Visala Andhra to be taken up later. No doubt, we wish that it takes place much earlier and at the earliest opportunity. Even if we want to, we cannot confine ourselves only to one particular problem. Now Mysore State has come into the agenda with the addition of Bellary district in the Mysore State. So, Sir, if this amendment is to be accepted unanimously and by all and particularly by all the Andhras, certainly mention must be made of the Mysore State as well as the Residuary State of Madras. Therefore, if the Government are prepared to accept that, then we do not have any objection to support their amendment.

“The general problem comes like this. It would be a Border Commission or Border Commissions that would take up the issue. There is no difficulty. They would go into all matters that are related to the Mysore State and the Andhra State, not only Bellary taluk but also Kolar district and Madakasira taluk. So also about Salem, and so many other taluks that are there which are claimed by the Andhras and about Chittoor where certain portions are claimed by our Tamilian friends. So the problem must cover the three States and it cannot be confined simply to the adjustment of the borders or boundary of the new State. That is why we are much apprehensive of the amendment moved by the Hon. the Chief Minister. I would like to know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether he means that his amendment would cover all these areas I have mentioned. If so, then we will have to consider it. Otherwise, it must be specifically stated that the borders between Mysore and Andhra and those between Andhra and Residuary Madras States would be taken by the Boundary Commission or Commissions. Then alone we would be in a position to support the motion.

“With these words, I wish the Hon. the Chief Minister clarifies his own position.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am in whole-hearted agreement with the sentiments expressed by my colleague Mr. Hanumantha Rao. In spite of the long explanation given by the Hon. Chief Minister, there still persists a feeling in my mind and in the minds of many others that in this matter of defining ‘which are the disputed areas’, the position is not clear. Now, it may be stated by the Hon. Chief Minister that the Boundary

17th July 1953] [Sri V. R. Nagarajan]

Commission will look into these things. But our suspicion now is whether the Boundary Commission will be limited to giving findings only on areas specified by the Central Government. Who knows what areas would be taken to be disputed areas and what areas would not be so taken? So to make matters clear and precise, especially in the matter of moving amendments, especially of a far-reaching nature, I would submit that there will be no harm in mentioning the districts, at least in the actual clause itself.

“ I submit, Sir, that the words ‘ Chittoor district ’ and ‘ Bellary district ’ may find a place in the clause so that there may not be any plausible doubt or trouble afterwards. Therefore I request the Government to consider this seriously and see that these two districts are included in the clause. Otherwise all the labour and all the agitations that have been going on in this regard may go waste and afterwards there may not be a chance to remedy any misfortune that may overtake us.” 11-50 a.m.

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“ While supporting the Government amendment I want to say a few words. I request the Government to add my amendment also to the Government amendment because the Hon. Chief Minister wanted to iron out the differences amongst the Andhras on the one side and Tamils and Kannadigas on the other. My Andhra friends are talking in a language and temper of Herr Hitler. They want every place in India.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“ I take serious objection to the words that Andhras are speaking like Herr Hitlers.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Let not two Members speak at a time.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“ I rise on a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is referring to Andhras as Herr Hitlers and I wish that Member does not call Andhras Herr Hitlers.”

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“ Sir, I never said that Andhras are Herr Hitlers. I only said that they were talking in a language which Herr Hitler used in 1939. He used one language when he occupied Czechoslovakia and another when he occupied Austria. Similarly my Andhra friends are claiming all territories which admittedly belong to other linguistic areas.

“ Sir, the Government in order to iron out all the differences brought forward this amendment so that all differences could be ironed out by the Boundary Commission. We have no objection to that. But my amendment refers only to certain areas which may be ceded to the Mysore State along with the areas mentioned in the clause. Ordinarily my amendment would be irrelevant if I had included the areas in Hyderabad, Orissa and other States. But in my amendment I only wanted that the Kanarese areas in the present Madras State, viz., South Kanara district, Nilgiris district, Kollegal taluk of Coimbatore district, Madakasira taluk and other few villages of Anantapur district, Hosur taluk and other few villages of Salem district, etc., contiguous to the Mysore State may

[Sri S. S. Kolkebail] [17th July 1953]

be ceded to Mysore as contemplated in clause 4 because we are far away from the seat of administration at Madras. South Kanara is about 650 miles from Madras and it has been neglected all along and all our cries are in the wilderness. Our area has been neglected in regard to irrigation, education, communications and in so many other fields. South Kanara has been neglected by this Government. We are very close to Mysore and we belong culturally to Mysore. Therefore I want all the Kanarese-speaking areas of the Madras State to be merged with the Mysore State. I request the House to accept my amendment."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, it appears as though the whole subject under discussion is the Government amendment. The Government are so clever as to bring in the amendment and the Hon. Chief Minister is clever enough to express his opinion on the amendment. It is right and proper that we should have our say because all the proceedings will be studied by the Members of the House of the People. Sir, the amendment moved by the Government is formal and ineffective. It is formal in the sense, in the words of the Hon. Chief Minister, it is open to the Central Government to appoint a Boundary Commission or not. Even if a Boundary Commission is appointed, it may take time and it is also left open to the Centre to bring their findings before the different State Legislatures and the Parliament itself. Therefore, the Government amendment is ineffective. As far as the resolution is concerned, it is also formal. But a number of amendments have been moved and the purport of all the amendments is that there are a number of disputed areas which should be settled. When we are sending our views to the House of the People, the House of the People should be fully informed of the views of this Legislature. The disputed areas are not just two items. For example, the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari would like to implicate in this amendment Chittoor and Bellary. If the Andhra State is to be a full-fledged State, all the disputed areas must be settled. When we are discussing a Bill of this type we would like the Centre to form the Andhra State in toto including the disputed areas in Orissa, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh, Mysore and the Residuary Madras. All these must be settled and we have to express our views in this House in regard to the formation of the Andhra State. This Bill, as Mr. Prakasam has pointed out, is not a Bill concerning the Andhra State only. It is diminishing the Madras State and increasing the Mysore State. It being so, the interests of Andhras should be taken into account while discussing this Bill. Therefore it is fit and proper that we in this House refer to the Centre that, while they appoint a Boundary Commission or Commissions, they must see that the Andhra State should be a full-fledged State and now or in the near future Boundary Commissions must be appointed to settle all issues. I therefore request the House to look at the problem from this angle."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, I have listened with rapt attention the clarification given by the Hon. Chief Minister. Unfortunately an impression has been gaining ground

17th July 1953]

[Sri K. Vinayakam]

in this House that the Government do not support the cause of either the Tamils or the Telugus or the cause of the Kanarese. All the three sections have got their own grouses about this amendment moved by the Government. An apprehension lurks in our minds that by this kind of nebulous amendment the rights of none of these sections of the people will be safeguarded properly. For instance, my friend Mr. G. Latchanna classifies the agitation in Chittoor district as law-breaking agitation whereas the agitation which is supposed to be carried on by those Telugus in the residuary area would not come to the forefront or to the public eye. It is misleading. I take strong objection to this kind of classification. Disputes are disputes whether they are brought to the notice of the people or not either by constitutional methods or unconstitutional methods. I am not afraid of facing a Boundary Commission if my Telugu friends believe that a Boundary Commission which is to be appointed would decide in their favour in respect of certain areas in Chingleput, North Arcot or Salem districts, or even in respect of the City of Madras. My Tamil friends need not have any such apprehension. The Boundary Commission to be appointed will have some amount of integrity and they will decide every dispute by going deep into the question and not by demonstrative methods and they will not be scared away as they were in some other parts.

“ I would even counsel some kind of patience to my Kannadiga friends. It is not as if Andhras will win public support simply because they are vociferous. Just as they have, there are so many other disputes arising in the borders between Andhras and Tamils also. I am glad that the dispute arising between the Tamils and Andhras in Chittoor will be enquired into by the Boundary Commission. But that is only a conjecture. Nothing specific about the case of Chittoor has found a place in the Government amendment. That is my grievance. In spite of the great agitation that has been going on in Tiruttani and other places in Chittoor district and in spite of the fact that the same has been taken notice of both by the Central as well as by the Provincial Government, yet Chittoor has not found a place here. In the proposed Andhra State, Chittoor has been included as an *undisputed* Telugu district. That is where we strongly register our protest. Chittoor cannot be by-passed as a wholly Telugu area. That is the very purpose behind our agitation. Let the Madras Government take particular care of the same. Thousands and thousands of Tamils are there in Tiruttani and other taluks of Chittoor district. Their cry cannot go unheard of. That is why I say specific mention may be made about Chittoor in the present Government amendment. ”

12
noon.

“ A question may well be asked by my Andhra friends about the Tamil areas of Chingleput, North Arcot and Hosur wherein the majority of Telugus live. Let me not be mistaken as though I fear the appointment of a Boundary Commission in those areas. I have had some experience with the Telugus of Chingleput and North Arcot districts. I know fully well that they are not much

[Sri K. Vinayakam]

[17th July 1953]

enamoured with the glamorous approaches that are being made by some Andhra protagonists. They are not very enthusiastic to merge themselves with the Andhra State, having Kurnool as the capital. It is a farce which these Andhra friends are doing."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"On a point of order, Sir. It is perfectly open to Mr. Vinayakam either to favour or refute the claims of Andhras. But to say it is a 'farce' is, I think, not proper."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"It is my personal opinion. I think the word 'farce' is parliamentary."

MR. SPEAKER:—"In the circumstances in which it is used it is not unparliamentary."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Another strange thing that I have noticed in this House is that many hon. Members seem to forget that the jurisdiction of our Legislature extends only to the whole area of the composite State as it is now existing. I am unable to understand the politics behind hon. Members of the House voicing their opinions for inclusion of areas (Telugu-speaking) from Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and even Mysore in the Andhra State."

"In conclusion let me wind up by saying that Chittoor cannot be classified as an undisputed Telugu area. Let the Government take note of the present agitation and let them declare it as a disputed area and let the Boundary Commission decide the issue."

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, now we are discussing a very difficult clause in the Bill, namely, the question of demarcation of the exact boundaries of the Andhra State. After all let us not forget the fact that these provinces have been carved out by the British Imperialists to suit their own whims and fancies. They never cared for any linguistic division or anything of that sort. After all when we are now about to divide the composite Madras State into Tamil and Telugu areas, it is but natural that disputes may arise in border areas between the Telugus and the Tamils. It is but natural that the two parties may put forth their respective claims. Let us not make the atmosphere bitter. What is needed is continued friendship between the new Andhra State and the residuary Madras State."

"The Hon. Chief Minister in order to allay misunderstanding on both sides had brought the present amendment favouring the appointment of one or two Boundary Commissions in the disputed border areas. That amendment covers a broad outline. He asked us not to extend the scope of it but in fact to restrict it. Of course we want to restrict it but it should not be ambiguous also. I want to express the strong feelings of some of the people in the border areas of the proposed Andhra State."

"Take for instance what Mr. Vinayakam had just now observed about the Tamils' claim over Chittoor district. Take again the claims of Kannadigas over the rest of the three taluks of

17th July 1953] [Sri C. Pulla Reddi]

Bellary, viz., Alur, Rayadrug and Adoni. There should be certain basic conceptions on which the Boundary Commissions should decide these border issues. The Communist Party had laid down long ago its policy in this direction. I shall refer to it later. I am glad that at least now Mr. Vinayakam had conceded that the Boundary Commission can enquire into the Telugu claim in Chinlaput and North Arcot districts. He could have made that clear in his resolution also but he has not done it.

“Let us try to understand the basic principle behind all these border disputes. I am prepared to concede that in the process of division, some Tamil villages might go to Andhra and some Andhra villages into residuary Madras. It is quite possible. It is equally possible that some Kannada speaking areas may go to Mysore and some other Kannada speaking areas to Andhra. Take for instance the Kannadiga claim over the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug. Take again their claim over Madakasira taluk in Anantapur district and then again the Telugu claim in Kolar and Tumkur. All these areas are in Andhra territory. Consider again the repeated claim of friends like Mr. Vinayakam over Tiruttani and other taluks in Chittoor. I say all these border disputes between Andhra and Madras on the one hand and Mysore and Andhra on the other are bound to arise in the process of division. Then the question may be well asked as to how are we to demarcate *exactly* the boundaries of Andhra, Madras and Mysore. It is here I want hon. Members to clearly note what the Communist Party has to say in this connexion. The Communist Party has prescribed a definite clear-cut method by which the Boundary Commission can exactly assess public opinion in these border areas.

“We have enunciated a democratic principle however much it may be unhappy to our Chief Minister. It is a democratic principle, I am sure he will concede it.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“It is a head breaking principle.”

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—“I am not asking for Madurai, as some friends from the South have done regarding Tirupati. This, I submit, is a principle to which the Hon. the Chief Minister can have no objection because we are not making any unreasonable demand, we are not demanding somewhere up to Madurai. It is quite another thing if we go back to history and look into the Telugu records. We have, therefore, said that the basis of the demarcation should be the language and contiguity of the border areas, taking the village as the lowest unit for the purpose of demarcation. The Communist amendment, I should say, is very precise. We are prepared to concede certain areas if Tamils are there in Chittoor and on the same principle, we must concede certain areas if Telugus are there but the over-riding principle is language contiguity, the village being taken as the lowest unit. We are not going to solve our problems except on the basis of this principle; neither the Tamil friends are going to get Tirupati nor will our Andhra friends get parts in the Madurai district. The

12-10
p.m.

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi]

[17th July 1952]

only result of all this will be raising bitter feelings. We want to avoid all this and that is why we are saying that the demarcation must be decided on the basis of language and contiguity taking the village as the unit. I hope our Friends from Kanuada area and Tamilnad will look into these things in a calm and dispassionate manner and will come to an agreement on this general democratic principle, not in the way in which the Chief Minister has moved the resolution on which any kind of construction can be put. I hope the House will accept the principle."

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—"மிஸ்டர் ஸ்பீக்கர், ஸார், எல்லைக்கம்பிஷன் நியமிப்பது சம்பந்தமாக சர்க்கார் ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கின்ற போது என்னுடைய திருத்தம் அவசியமா என்று குறிப்பாக தமிழ் நாட்டு அங்கத்தினர்கள் கேட்கலாம். என்னுடைய திருத்தத்திற்கு அவசியம் என்ன வென்பதை விளக்குவதற்காகத்தான், உங்கள் முன்னால் நான் இப்பொழுது பேச முன்வந்திருக்கின்றேன்.

"சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள திருத்தணி, பல்வெனேரி, கங்குந்திக்குப்பம், புத்தூர், சங்கரகிரி, சித்தூர் ஆகிய ஆறு தாலுகாக்களை எஞ்சிய சென்னை மாகாணத்தோடு (Residuary State of Madras) சேர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கோருவதுதான் என்னுடைய திருத்தமாகும்.

"The President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiring into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas' என்றுதான் சர்க்கார் திருத்தத்தில் காணப்படுகிறது. 'In certain border areas' என்பதற்குப் பதிலாக 'contiguous linguistic area' என்று போட்டிருப்பார்களேயானால், தமிழ் ராஜ்யத்தைச் சேர்ந்தாற்போலிருக்கின்ற ஆறு தாலுகாக்களும் நிச்சயமாக இதில் வருவதற்கு இப்பிருக்க முடியும். அப்படியில்லாமல், இப்பொழுது இருக்கின்ற சர்க்கார் திருத்தமானது ('border') ஓரமாகவுள்ள ஒன்றிரண்டு கிராமங்களைச் சேர்க்கமுடியுமே தவிர, சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கின்ற தமிழ்ப் பிரதேசமாகிய ஆறு தாலுகாக்களைச் சேர்க்க முடியாது என்று நினைக்கின்றேன். இந்தச் சபையின் தலைவரோ அல்லது முதல் அமைச்சர் அவர்களோ இதற்கு ஒரு clarification கொடுப்பார்களேயானால் மிக நன்றாக இருக்கும்.

"இன்னொரு பிரச்சனையும் எழலாம். அதாவது, நான் மேலே சொன்ன மாதிரி செய்தால் சென்னை நகரம் சம்பந்தமாகவும் தகராறு ஏற்படக்கூடும் என்று சிலர் நினைக்கலாம். அப்படி நினைக்கவேண்டியதில்லை. ஏனென்றால், சென்னையைச் சுற்றிலும் தமிழ்ப் பிரதேசங்கள்தான் இருக்கின்றனவேயொழிய, தெலுங்கு பேசக்கூடிய பிரதேசம் இல்லையென்றுதான் சொல்ல முடியும். ஆகையால், சென்னை நகரமானது 'disputed area' என்ற முறையில் சேர்க்க முடியாது முடியாது. ஆகவே, சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள தமிழ்ப் பிரதேசங்களாகிய ஆறு தாலுகாக்களையும் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்துடன் சேர்க்கவேண்டுமென்ற என்னுடைய திருத்தத்தை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

"இந்தத் திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருப்பதற்குக் காரணம் என்னவென்று சற்று விளக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. 1911-ம் வருஷத்திற்குமுன் சித்தூர் ஜில்லா என்று ஒரு ஜில்லா இருக்கவில்லை. சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவின் தமிழ்ப் பகுதி வட ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவோடு இருந்தது. 1911-ம் வருஷத்தில் தான் அந்தப் பகுதி வட ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து பிரிக்கப்பட்டது என்பதையும் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகின்றேன்.

"எனது நண்பர்கள் ஸ்ரீ கே. வினாயகம் அவர்களும், ஸ்ரீ துரைக்கண்ணு அவர்களும் இப்பொழுது இந்த சபையில் அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். தமிழர்கள் பெரும்பாலாக இருக்கின்ற பிரதேசத்திலிருந்து வந்த எனது நண்பர்கள் ஸ்ரீ எம். அனந்தசயனம் அய்யங்கார் அவர்களும், ஸ்ரீ வரதாச்சாரி அவர்களும் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்களென்றால், அதற்குக் காரணம், அவர்கள் தமிழர்கள் என்ற முறையில் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

17th July 1953]

[Sri K. T. Kosalam]

தமிழர்கள் என்ற முறையில் அவர்கள் தேர்தலில் நின்ற காரணத்தினால் தான் மெஜாரியாகவுள்ள தமிழர்கள் அவர்களைத் தேர்ந்தெடுத்திருக்கின்றார்கள் என்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை. தமிழர்கள் என்று தேர்தலில் நின்றால் தான் மக்கள் அவர்களைத் தேர்ந்தெடுப்பார்கள் என்பது அவர்களுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும்.

“நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ அனந்தசயனம் அய்யங்கார் அவர்கள் தெலுங்கு பேசலாம்; நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ வரதாச்சாரி அவர்களும் தெலுங்கு பேசலாம். அவர்கள் தெலுங்கு பேசுவதினால் மட்டும் அவர்கள் தெலுங்கர்கள் என்று சொல்ல முடியாது. இன்று வேண்டுமானால் அவர்கள் ஆந்திரர்களுடைய கட்சிக்காகப் போராடலாம். ஆனால், அவர்கள் தமிழர்கள் என்ற காரணத்தினால் தான் அங்கு பெரும்பாலானவர்கள் தமிழர்கள் அவர்களுக்கு வோட்டு போட்டு தேர்ந்தெடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை மறந்துவிடக்கூடாது. அவர்கள் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட பகுதிகள் ஆந்திரத்தோடு சேரவேண்டுமென்று அவர்கள் அன்று சொல்லியிருப்பாரேனானால், அங்குள்ள பெரும்பாலானவர்கள் தமிழ் மக்கள் அவர்களுக்கு வோட்டு போட்டிருக்கமாட்டார்கள் என்பது நிச்சயம்.

“தமிழ் நாட்டில் ரெட்டியார் என்பவர்கள்கூட தெலுங்கு பேசுவார்கள். அப்படித் தெலுங்கு பேசுவதினால் மட்டும் அவர்கள் ஆந்திரர்கள் என்று சொல்ல முடியுமா? அப்படிப்பார்த்தால், ஸ்ரீ ஓ. பி. ராமசாமி ரெட்டியார் கூட தெலுங்கர் என்று சொல்லிவிட முடியுமா? சொல்ல முடியாது.

“சித்தூர் ஜில்லாப் பகுதிகளில் ரெட்டியார்கள் என்ற ஜாதியார் இருப்பதாகச் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. அவர்கள் ரெட்டியார்கள் அல்ல. நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ வினாயகம் அவர்கள் சொன்னதுபோல, ஸ்ரீ கஜபதி ரெட்டியார் போன்றவர்கள் இருக்கின்றார்களே அவர்கள் எல்லாம் வன்னிய குலத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள், பட்டையாட்சி, நாயக்கர் போன்ற வகுப்பைச் சேர்ந்தவர்களாவர். ஆகவே, அங்குள்ள தமிழர்களாகிய ரெட்டியார் என்று சொல்லப்படுகின்றவர்கள், ரெட்டியார் என்று போட்டுக்கொள்ளுவதால் மட்டும் அவர்கள் ஆந்திரர்களாகிவிட மாட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் உண்மையிலேயே வன்னியர், பட்டையாட்சி, நாயக்கர் போன்ற வகுப்பைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் தான். ரெட்டியார் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்வதினாலோ, தெலுங்கு பேசுவதினாலோ அவர்கள் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ ரங்கர் ரெட்டியைப் போன்ற ஆந்திர ரெட்டிகள் ஆகமாட்டார்கள். ஆந்திரத்தைச் சேர்ந்த ரெட்டி வேறு, தமிழ் நாட்டைச் சேர்ந்த ரெட்டி வேறு. ஆகவே, அந்த ஆறு தாலாகாக்களும் தமிழ் நாட்டைச் சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டும்.

“ஆந்திரதேசம் பிரிந்தவுடன், சென்னை ராஜ்யத்திலுள்ள பகுதிகள் Residuary State of Madras என்றுதான் வழங்கப்படுகிறது. எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தில், கன்னடியர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இங்கே பாதுகாப்பு இருக்கிறது. அவர்களுடைய உரிமைகளுக்கு இங்கே பாதுகாப்பு இருக்கிறது. அதே முறையில் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தில் மலையாளிகள் இருக்கின்றார்கள். அவர்களுக்கும் போதிய பாதுகாப்பு இருக்கிறது. தமிழர்கள், மலையாளிகள், கன்னடியர்கள் எல்லோரும் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கிறார்கள். இங்குள்ள சட்ட சபையிலும் இந்த முன்று பிரதேசத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், ஆந்திர ராஜ்யமானது அந்த முறையில் இல்லை. ஆந்திர தேசத்தில் கன்னடியர்கள் இருக்கமுடியாது. கன்னடம் பேசுகிறவர்கள் விரட்டப்பட்டு, தனி ஆந்திர மாகாணமாக அமையப்போகிறது. கன்னடம் பேசுவவர்கள் அந்த சட்ட சபையில் இருக்க முடியாது. ஆகவே, கன்னடம் பேசுகின்ற பெல்லாரியையும் அவர்கள் சேர்த்துக்கொண்டு அவர்களுடைய உரிமைகளைப் பாதுகாக்க ஆந்திரத்தில் முடியாது. ஆகவே, தெலுங்கு பேசும் தனி மாகாணமாக அது அமையப்போகிறதென்பதை யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாது. ஆனால், எஞ்சிய சென்னை மாகாணத்தை நாம் தமிழ் நாடு என்று அழைக்கவில்லை. Residuary State of Madras என்றுதான் சொல்லுகிறோம். இங்கே பல பாஷைகளைப் பேசுகிறவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். இங்கு எல்லா பாஷை பேசுவவர்களுக்கும் நாம் மரியாதை கொடுக்கிறோம். அவர்களுடைய உரிமைகளுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு அளித்திருக்கிறோம். ஆகவே, சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலே

[Sri K. T. Kosalram] [17th July 1953]

யுள்ள தமிழர்கள் பெரும்பாலாக இருக்கின்ற 6 தாலுகாக்களில் ஒரு சில தெலுங்கர்கள் இருந்தால்கூட அவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க நம்மால் முடியும்.

“மதத்தின் பேரால் அரசாங்கம் அமைக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு பாகிஸ்தான் ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், இந்தியாவானது மத அடிப்படையில் இல்லாமல், மதப்பற்றற்ற ஒரு தேசமாக விளங்குகிறது. இந்தியாவில் எந்த மதத்தினருக்கும் சம உரிமைகள் வழங்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஆகவே, ஆந்திரர்கள் மொழியின் பேரால், ஒரு அரசாங்கத்தை அமைக்க விரும்புகிறார்கள். அந்த முறையில் ஆந்திர ராஜ்யம் அமைக்கப்படவேண்டும். ஆகவே, அங்கிருக்கின்ற மெஜாரிட்டியாக உள்ள தமிழர்கள் எஞ்சிய சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் இருப்பதைத்தான் விரும்புகின்றார்கள். அதுதான் அவர்கள் நோக்கமாகும், ஆகவே, எந்த முறையில் பார்த்தாலும் சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள தமிழ்ப் பகுதிகளாகிய 6 தாலுகாக்கள் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்துடன் சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டியது மிக அவசியமாகும்.

“சித்தூர் ஜில்லா தமிழர்களுக்கு ஆந்திர மாகாணத்தில் எந்தவிதமான பாதுகாப்பும் இருக்கமுடியாது. அங்குள்ள மக்கள் ஆந்திர மாகாணத்தில் இருப்பதை ஒருபோதும் விரும்பமாட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தோடுதான் இருக்க விரும்புகிறார்கள். உதாரணமாக எடுத்துக் கொண்டால், திருவாங்கூரில் உள்ள நாஞ்சில் நாட்டுத் தமிழர்கள் எந்த விதமான கஷ்டத்தை அனுபவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதைப் பார்த்துக்கொண்டும். அவர்கள் எத்தகைய நிலைமையில் இருக்கின்றார்கள், எவ்வளவு கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை, நாஞ்சில் நாட்டுப் பகுதியிலிருந்து வந்த நான் நன்கு அறிவேன். அதேமாதிரி ஸ்ரீ வி. கே. ராமசாமி முதலியார் அறிவார்கள். அங்கிருக்கின்ற தமிழர்கள் எத்தகைய இன்னல்களை அனுபவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள் என்பதை இங்குள்ள அங்கத்தினர்கள் அறிவார்களேயானால், சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கின்ற 6 தாலுகாக்களை ஆந்திரத்தோடு சேர்க்காமல் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தோடு சேர்ப்பது எவ்வளவு அவசியம் என்பது தெரிந்துகொள்ள முடியும். ஆகவே, இவையெல்லாவற்றையும் மனதில் வைத்துக்கொண்டு இங்குள்ள அத்தனை அங்கத்தினர்களும், என்னுடைய திருத்தத்திற்கு நிச்சயமாக சாதகமாக வோட்டு அளிக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். அவர்கள் சாதகமாக இருப்பார்கள் என்பதில் ஐயமில்லை. தவிர, என்னுடைய கன்னட நண்பர்களையும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்; கன்னடியர்களும் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கப்போகிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு இங்கு இருக்கின்றது. ஆகவே, இந்தச் சபையிலிருக்கும் கன்னட அங்கத்தினர்களும் என்னுடைய திருத்தத்திற்கு நிச்சயமாக முழு ஆதரவைத் தராமல் இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் ஆதரவு இருக்கும் என்ற நம்பிக்கை எனக்கு இருக்கிறது.

“திருப்பதி சம்பந்தமாக ஒரு வார்த்தை. முதல் அமைச்சர் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய பூர்வீகமான ஊர் திருப்பதியாகும். இதைவிட இன்னொரு காரணம் வேறு என்னவேண்டும்? திருப்பதி ராஜாஜியினுடைய ஊர். அந்த ஊரிலேயே அவர்களுடைய முதாதையர்கள் பிறந்தார்கள். இந்தத் தமிழகத்தைச் சேர்ந்த, தமிழ் நாட்டிலே பிறந்த, இந்த தேசத்திற்கு ஒரு பெரும் தலைவர் என்ற முறையிலே இன்னொரு விளங்குகின்ற ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் பிறந்த தமிழகம்தான் திருப்பதி யென்றால், அதைக் கேட்பதற்கு தமிழர்களுக்கு ஏன் உரிமையில்லை? அவர்களுக்கு எல்லா உரிமைகளும் இருக்கின்றன. திருப்பதி தமிழ்நாட்டைச் சேர்ந்ததல்ல என்று சொல்லுவதற்கு என்ன காரணம் இருக்கிறது?

12-20
p.m.

“ஆந்திரர்களும், மற்றவர்களும் பிரிந்த பின்பும் சுமுகமாக இருக்க வேண்டும். சிநேகமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். நாம் ஒத்து இருக்கவேண்டும். சகோதரர்கள் பேரல் வாழவேண்டும். நமக்கு மிகவும் வேண்டியவராக அங்கு பிரகாசம்காரு இருக்கின்றார். அவர் பொருப்புள்ளவராக இருக்கின்றார். நமக்கும் அவர்களுக்கும் கசப்பு வேண்டாமென்று சொல்லுகிறோம். கசப்பில்லாமல் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கு நான் ஒரு

17th July 1953]

[Sri K. T. Kosalam]

யோசனை சொல்லவிரும்புகின்றேன். அதாவது திருப்பதியை centrally administered area என்று ஆக்கிவிடவேண்டும். திருப்பதிக்கு எல்லா மொழி பேசக்கூடியவர்களும் வருகிறார்கள். தேசமெங்குமுள்ள மக்கள் வெங்கடேசப் பெருமானை தரிசிக்க அங்கு வருகின்றார்கள். அது தேசத் திற்கே மிக முக்கியமான இடமாக இருக்கின்றது. ஆகவே திருப்பதியை ஒரு centrally administered area ஆகச் செய்வதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்யலாம் என்பதை யோசனை செய்து பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

“நான் சர்க்காரையும், இங்கிருக்கின்ற அங்கத்தினர்களையும் கேட்டுக் கொள்வதென்னவென்றால், சித்தார் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள ஆறு தமிழ்த் தாலுகாக்களையும் எஞ்சிய சென்னை ராஜ்யத்துடன் சோக்கவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற என் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரிக்கவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால், சாக்கார் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கின்ற திருத்தத்தில் in certain border areas என்பதற்கு பதிலாக in contiguous linguistic area என்று ஒரு திருத்தம் செய்வார்களேயானால் இந்த சர்க்காருக்கு நன்றி செலுத்தக் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கின்றேன்.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister has been struggling very hard from yesterday to convince hon. Members and leaders in this House and an amendment has been brought before the House to-day. Sri Latchanna raised certain points for clarification because he mentioned about Orissa but his points remain yet unanswered. In the amendment now proposed in the name of Sri Subramaniam I would invite particular reference of hon. Members to the last sentence relating to Part II and this is what is stated—

“... the President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions ... for making recommendations as to any adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundary of the Andhra State in those areas.”

Boundaries have been tentatively fixed for approval of the Central Government and if any adjustments are to be made it is inside that boundary. Is it for this that this amendment has been suggested? The clause reads very soft and the explanations will be very convincing as they appear but the difficult thing is what it contains. If Rajaji is going to remain till all these troubles are over and all the problems are solved, perhaps there may be some assurance that he will certainly work for justice. But, Sir, no one knows what will happen in the future. This is going to be an Act of Parliament and people who may be coming to rule this Province in future may say there is the thing in the Act of Parliament and we shall be guided by what it means and we are not at all bothered with the rest of what happened and that is why hon. Members are very particular about consideration word by word, sentence by sentence and clause by clause of all these amendments.

“Sri Vinayagam was speaking about the great fascination of the City of Madras; I agree it is a fascinating city; but it is made up of your own blood and sweat and my blood and sweat; it is not your property alone and it is not your pride alone, it is the pride of the entire province of Madras. Can I say that you are usurping it? You are using it.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I advise the hon. Member to address the Chair and not the hon. Member Sri Vinayagam.”

[17th July 1953]

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI:—“ I am sorry, Sir. But let me ask, Sir, what is the fascination for the Madras City for Sri Kolle-bail to protest that the Kannada area in the southern districts have not been taken care of by the authorities here. If they were so very particular about the Kannada area in the Bellary district, they should have been equally particular about the Kannada areas in the southern districts. Did they consult Members that represent the Kannada areas in the southern districts? Perhaps it was done without their knowledge. To-day the majority of the Members from the Kannada areas come from the southern districts and if they ask about this, we must plead guilty. Mysore is a very fascinating city and Bangalore is the most fascinating city for the Kannadigas that come from the southern districts. Should they not be given a chance, should they not be given an opportunity to tell their Kannadiga friends of the constituencies from which they come that they have tried to take those areas into the Mysore State and they tried but in vain. Unfortunately the Chief Minister had been telling many times that all these problems are between the Andhras and residuary Madras. As my hon. Friend Sri Prakasam asked: ‘ Where did Mysore come in; if Mysore comes into the picture, it must come for all the Kannada area in the Madras State; it could not be only for Bellary but not for the other areas. If the residuary Bellary is found to be a burden that burden should be thrown upon the Andhras and if the Andhras had said that they did not want this burden, then would have been the time for you to say that the residuary Bellary should go to Mysore. Nobody ever asked the Andhras or the people that represent the Andhra State whether they would be prepared to bear the burden and whether they are ripe to bear the burden of the residuary Bellary. If you have taken care to throw over Bellary to Mysore, you should have taken the same care to throw the Kannada areas in the southern districts over to Mysore. Perhaps they are yielding more income to the City and the City of Madras is more fascinating to them than the City of Mysore and Bangalore. These are some of the things which I am not able to understand. There has been so much of talk about Chittoor. I was just now hearing the speech of Sri Kosalram who was speaking in Tamil. Many of my friends in Chittoor know Tamil but I know very little Tamil and I have just the knowledge for usage in the hotels where I can order the things I require. (Sri K. Vinayagam: ‘ You know perhaps how to abuse in Tamil.’) That is perhaps a contamination which word I cannot forget. I am compelled to say that Sri Vinayagam is perhaps more fascinating than the City itself and that is how he attracts the attention of everybody. It is contended that Chittoor is a Tamil district. My submission is that the district of Chittoor is the border for Chingleput, North Arcot, Salem, Mysore and many other areas. If that claim is to be made, then Chittoor will have to speak about the other districts also. Is it the idea of the Government to recommend to the Government of India for their more serious consideration, places where disputes have arisen. Have opportunities been given to people in other places to express themselves in favour

17th July 1953] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

of going to the Andhra State. Let me take Hosur. The elected representative from that district is Sri Muni Reddi and he has been submitting here to the Government and the Ministers one after another that the interests of the people there are not properly attended to perhaps for the reason that it is linguistically different. They have been making such a complaint time after time. Sri Rajaji is always trying to explain to me what it is and I always welcome it because it affords me more and more matter for complaint. Sri Muni Reddi was an important figure in the Congress circles of Tamilnad and I think he was a Member of the Tamil Nad Congress Committee; he is a qualified man, a good worker and a real leader, a man beloved by the people but with all that he was denied a Congress ticket in the last elections. That is how the Congress went to pieces last time. They did not put up the real men and they refused Sri Muni Reddi a Congress ticket; he had not at the time the other parties to support him in the election and he had none except the Andhras in the Hosur taluk to support him. He took the challenge of the great Congress organization; he took the challenge of the son of our C. Rajagopalachari, our Chief Minister. He canvassed his voters in Telugu; he brought speakers from Kalahasti and Chittoor and he was able to convince the Andhra masses and the result we know and Sri Muni Reddi was returned to this House in spite of the forces ranged against him. When Hosur returned Sri Muni Reddi as against the wishes and powers of the opposing candidates, you will have to pause and consider whether there was this dispute or not. What I am submitting to you to-day is that that is an Andhra area. When Tamil friends are starting an agitation in Tiruttani, I begged them and requested them not to indulge in these things."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member will continue his speech after the lunch interval."

"The House will now adjourn and re-assemble after lunch at 3 p.m."

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this problem has been dealt with at large by all the hon. Members but there are a few more ideas which I would like to place before the House. My Friends from Bellary have given notice of amendments about the taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug. I concede that they have a right to demand reconsideration of these three taluks and if there are any villages belonging to them they can take them. They can take them with them, if they are there. Although it is a declaration made by the Government of India and the Prime Minister of India, as people of Andhra we are all one in conceding to those Friends that the taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug must be examined. I say that there are certain villages in them which belong to the Kannadigas. Let them take them but I appeal to my Kannadiga Friends to show the same gesture, the same sense of justice to their Andhra friends and when we say that we are ready to concede them a re-examination of Alur, Adoni

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [17th July 1953]

and Rayadrug taluks, they should also concede our just demand that the question of Bellary city and the firkas of Moka and Rupanagudi should be re-examined.

“ Even in the case of the Chittoor district, I shall be only too pleased if my Friend, Sri K. Vinayakam and others who agree with him in claiming six taluks of Chittoor, come to Chittoor district and hold meetings in Kalahasti, Tirupathi, Tiruttani and Palamaneri and, if the people are agreed that the whole of the Chittoor district should be in the residuary State, I think my Andhra Friends will agree to that. They can even come to-morrow and I will arrange the meetings for them. In my own constituency of Vayalpad there is not even a single Tamilian. If the people express their desire either to be in Andhra or the residuary State or in Karnataka, it should be agreed to.

“ My Friend, Sri Sirasappa, said that as the declaration regarding Kannadiga areas had been made by the Prime Minister of India, it should not be questioned. I am only sorry to tell my Friend that this should not be the spirit of a public worker. After all we meet in so many conferences and conventions and we speak as one people. Our interests, our demands, our peace and prosperity are all common. When such is the case, where the people of a particular area feel that they should express their own opinion they should be given the right to choose where they would like to go whether it be Andhra, or Tamilnad or Karnataka. They should be given the choice to present their own opinions to the country at large and to the authorities both at Madras and Delhi.

“ Sir, friends in deeper Tamilnad and in the Circars do not know what a painful job, what a difficult and arduous task is this problem of the border areas. In these border areas, our inclinations, our interests, our tastes and our language are both ways. It is either Telugu-Tamil or Telugu-Kannada or Tamil-Kannada and as such I request that these border people must be given the choice to express their own opinions—not a choice on records. I say that some of these records, call it the census or other records, are prepared by interested persons. They are one-sided in some places and in others prepared according to the whims and fancies of those people who go into them. My Friend, Sri K. Vinayagam, referring to himself said that he and his people are called Reddiars though they belong to the Vannia Kula Kshatriya community. But I must tell him that many of my relatives in Chittoor taluk who are Reddiars have been recorded as Tamilians. This is a fact which cannot be disputed. The people who collected the census statistics were one-sided and prejudiced. They wanted to make out a case for the future so that my Friend Vinayagam and others could exaggerate their case and bring the whole of Chittoor district to their side. Even in regard to Bellary taluk, I am told that some important Kannadigas, would prefer to be with their Telugu friends. As Sri Vinayagam so strongly pleads, should they not be given a choice? I also know that in some villages of Chittoor district some Telugu friends would prefer to be in the residuary State. It is not proper or just to deny them the choice

17th July 1953] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

to express their wish. When hon. Member, Sri Gangappa, was in Delhi he submitted to the Prime Minister of India to consider the question of holding an election in Bellary taluk including the firkas of Moka and Rupanagudi and, if it was agreed to, and the whole of the people felt that they should be with Andhra, they should be given that choice; or, if some firkas would like to go to Karnataka they should be given the opportunity to do so. But, if these firkas and the District Headquarters, Bellary City, preferred to remain with the Andhras they should be given that convenience.

“ Sir, I would like to submit to the mover of this amendment, the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam, that it smells of suspicion. I would like him to remove these suspicions and to redraft it before it is finally accepted and place it before the hon. Members here for full discussion. Let not want of time for consideration or for translating it into English or the warning from the Speaker's bell stand in the way of arriving at an amendment agreeable to all. I know, Sir, that every Member here is interested in voicing forth his suspicions. It is a great occasion, Sir, because it is not the question of these boundaries alone that is going to torture us. As long ago as 17 years the boundary was fixed between Orissa and Madras States and we know what amount of insults and injuries have been heaped upon the Andhras in Berhampur and Koraput, how their children are not given facilities for progress, how their interests are jeopardised and how their trade is suppressed. Especially, the prosperous businessmen of Berhampur who were once the masters in that area have been reduced to the position of slaves. They have been reduced to penury and they feel that they could as well leave that area and come back to Andhra. It is such things that pinch us. Therefore, Sir, when we go out, let us have the opportunity of going out fully prosperous. Let us take your leave with a feeling that you are sending us with a feeling that Andhra is fully prosperous. Do not be a Kabandha but give us all those people who wish to be with us. Do not put them on their trial at a later date. Send our friends with us and let us live in peace and prosperity.”

* SRI V. K. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—“ Mr. Speaker, 3-10
Sir, the amendment suggested by the Government is a very simple p.m.
and plain one and I do not see any reason why there should be any controversy at all. It recommends the appointment of one or more Boundary Commissions for enquiring into the disputes that have arisen in border areas. So far as my district of Chingleput is concerned there is no difficulty and it will continue to remain within the undisputed areas of the residuary State. Hon. Members of this House would have heard yesterday some unfounded allegations made by Mr. Prakasam about the Oothukottai affair. He made some charges that a teacher attached to a High School in that place was victimised on the ground that he was an Andhra. I must express at the outset that there was no question of an Andhra or a Tamilian, much less the victimisation of an Andhra in that area. It is not correct to make any statement on hearsays.

[Sri V. K. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [17th July 1953]

The subject relates to the transfer of a teacher. (Interruption from Sri T. Prakasam.) The teacher had misappropriated some money with the result that he had to be kept under suspension. The charges against the teacher were all very serious, and the climax came when he took active part in all the political meetings and he was one of the organizers of a public meeting at Oothukottai that was addressed by my hon. Friend Sri T. Prakasam. These are the facts of the matter referred to by the hon. Member Sri T. Prakasam. I am not sure whether the hon. Member has been posted with all this correct information, and that is why I have to refute his statement.

“As I have already stated there is no dispute whatsoever with regard to my district of Chingleput. I am also of opinion that many of the taluks in the district of Chittoor and most of the villages in Nellore district area where the Tamilians predominate should come to the residuary State. I am sure the Boundary Commission will go into this matter, very deeply. I do not know why my Friend Sri Vinayagam wants that the Boundary Commission should be invited to visit Tinnevely and other places. The Boundary Commission, I am sure, will go into this question of demarcation of boundaries and see that predominantly Tamil areas are included in the residuary State. We have also been agitating for the inclusion of Tirupati and other places in the residuary State. I would request my Andhra friends to concede the demands of Tamilians and the sooner they concede them, the better for them also. I am sure the Government will bear in mind all these facts and make a strong recommendation to the Central Government on the lines suggested above. I do not wish to say anything more. I request the hon. Members to support the amendment *in toto*.” Thank you, Sir, for giving me the opportunity to speak.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Mr. T. Anantha Pai will now speak.”

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI:—“As I would like to have some clarification from the Hon. the Chief Minister, may I request you, Sir, to call me a little later.”

SRI K. VENKAIAH:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment proposed by the Government is very vague. The question of fixing the boundaries of the new Andhra State which is now being discussed is a very important one. I wish to remind Mr. Vinayagam and other Tamil friends that the Prime Minister of India, in the third week of December, had given a statement that the exact boundaries of the new Andhra State would be decided through one or more Boundary Commissions and he had further stated that the Boundary Commissions would recommend such adjustments as might be considered necessary in regard to the boundaries of that State with the residuary State of Madras and the Mysore State. The very fact that the division of Bellary district has been decided upon between the new Andhra State and the Mysore State and that certain parts of Bellary district are proposed to be attached to the Mysore State raises the question of Telugu-speaking areas in the Mysore State. We know, many of

17th July 1953]

[Sri K. Venkaiah]

the areas in Kolar district are populated by Telugu people. Many of the people there who speak Telugu language are struggling for lack of High Schools using Telugu medium. Recently I have come to know that the Bellary District Ryots Association has passed a resolution to the effect that all the Telugu-speaking areas in Bellary district should be attached to the Andhra State. Three-fourths of Kolar district in the Mysore State is populated by Telugu-speaking people and that area has to be detached from the Mysore State and attached to the new Andhra State. The recent verdict of Justice Misra is very unsatisfactory. He has decided that almost the whole of Bellary district should be included in the Mysore State. This has created much dissatisfaction among the Andhra people, especially those in Bellary taluk.

“ So it is essential that the Government should go into the whole affair and appoint a Boundary Commission to settle disputes arising out of the partition of the Madras State in view of the fact that certain Telugu-speaking areas are being separated from the Andhra State and added to the Mysore State. The Boundary Commission must also consider the question of Kolar and the Telugu areas in the Mysore State. In addition there are parts of North Arcot district (Gudiyatham taluk) and parts of Salem district (Krishnagiri taluk) where Telugu-speaking people are in a majority. These areas should be taken and added to the Andhra State in view of the fact that the people there have already expressed their willingness to be within the Andhra State. All these questions have to be decided by a Boundary Commission. The Government motion is very vague in this aspect and does not clarify or define the areas which the Boundary Commission may have to decide. I therefore propose that the Government should reconsider its own amendment and mention definitely the areas where the Boundary Commission should intervene and decide the issue.”

3-20
P.m.

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“ Sir, I had fondly hoped that this should not be the occasion for the Members of this House to divide themselves and have a bitter argument about the division of the State and the demarcation of the boundaries. But unfortunately the course of events and circumstances have led us to discuss the question of the territories and the boundaries in a feeling of certain amount of bitterness. We had hoped that all of us would accept the statement of the Hon. the Prime Minister when he said that the new Andhra State shall be formed with the undisputed eleven Telugu districts and the three taluks of the Bellary district and we had also hoped that after the State is formed, we as friends, as good neighbours and as Indians would come together and with the same respect we have for our own languages would respect the people who speak other languages and divide the territory in a way that would leave no bitterness among the people. We had also hoped that if there are pockets of other languages in the new State of Andhra, if there are pockets of languages in the residuary State of Madras or if there are pockets of languages in

[Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi] [17th July 1953]

other States, we would amicably settle them and create new boundaries and represent to the Government of India to demarcate those boundaries by a Bill of Parliament. If unfortunately that was not possible, we could have asked the Government of India to appoint a Boundary Commission to so demarcate the areas. You will see from the amendment, which I have given notice of, that that is exactly what I have sought to do. I do not want to add my voice to the claims and counter-claims that have been made in this House this morning and I will appeal to all the Members not to aggravate the bitter feelings that are being generated by these claims and counter-claims. I respect the love of anybody for his own language and I equally expect others too to respect the love of the other people for their own languages. First of all I wish to make it clear that I am not one of those who believe that if people speak the same language, they shall mean more to me than those who speak other languages. Now that it has become inevitable for various reasons to form linguistic States, let us not further aggravate the feelings by creating conditions which will cause bitterness. I would very strongly support the feelings of the hon. Member Sri Vinayagam when he says 'Let there be a Boundary Commission and let there be a free determination of the will of the people to find out where they want to live—whether it be in the Andhra State or in the residuary Madras State or in the Mysore State.' Let us do it in a friendly way and demarcate the boundaries wherever necessary. Unfortunately the Government has thought it fit to bring in an amendment to this clause and I am glad that the Hon. the Chief Minister has clarified it beyond any doubt. It is true that it seeks to recognize the dispute in Chittoor district but at the same time it makes the Government of India to understand that the Telugus of other districts or other areas have no desire to be separated from their present association or to come to the Andhra State. I cannot contradict the hon. Members when they said that certain Telugu people in the residuary Madras State or in Mysore State will not desire to come into the Andhra State. It is necessary that it should be decided whether those people want to come to the Andhra State or want to remain where they are. This amendment seeks to point out that there is no such dispute but that there is a dispute only in the district of Chittoor. I am prepared to agree. There is some Tamil area in Chittoor but at the same time I would expect the hon. Members to say that there are Telugu areas. I am not claiming any part of Bellary or any part of Chingleput or anywhere. I merely say that the Government of India shall take the necessary steps to appoint a Boundary Commission to determine the new boundaries. That is exactly what Mr. Justice Wanchóo said in his report. I do not want that this should be done immediately or before the appointed day. We should represent to the Government of India that all of us unanimously desire that a Boundary Commission should be appointed on a date which the Government of India may think it convenient and right to determine if the people of those areas desire to come into the new State or desire to stay where they are or to ascertain to which State they

17th July 1953] [Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi]

would like to come. I would therefore request the Hon. Minister Sri C. Subramaniam to withdraw the amendment because it is unnecessary. Otherwise I am afraid that in many areas people will start agitation in the fear that their desire may not be recognized and that is bad not only for the people but for the whole country. It will aggravate feelings in many areas and will bring in further complications. I request the hon. Members to support my amendment and I request the Hon. Minister Sri C. Subramaniam to withdraw his amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, first of all I will read the amendment given on behalf of our Communist Party and then I will try to explain the stand we take on the other amendments given notice of and particularly on that given on behalf of the Government by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam. Here one point is to be taken into consideration. Most of the amendments barring that given notice of by the Hon. the Minister for Finance are either similar or identical and differ only here and there. It is unfortunate that on behalf of the Government (including the Ministers from the Andhra area and other areas) the Hon. Minister in charge of Finance comes forward with an amendment on which even his own party men are not agreed. I hope the Government will consider its position once again and see if they can better that amendment if they cannot withdraw it. I am sure that our amendments will satisfy all parties and groups, of all nationalities, in Mysore, Madras and Andhra States. The amendments have been drafted with the main idea of doing justice and to ensure that the present Madras State is properly divided on linguistic considerations.

" We have explained our stand on the general debate on this Bill. We have said that language and contiguity village-war should be taken into consideration. There may still be pockets here and there where a language other than the language of the State predominates. But their existence cannot be made an excuse for denying the right of linguistic division. We differ from the Hon. Chief Minister in this respect. Yesterday he explained his view that it was not advisable to have linguistic States and adduced so many arguments in support of it. He referred to the headworks of the Tungabhadra Project and asked whether the people of Rayalaseema were not interested in the distribution of the waters conserved by the project. If the headworks of the project were to be in Mysore, that does not mean that the benefit of the project should not go to the Andhra State. Let me pose this question to the Hon. Chief Minister and his supporters. The Cauvery runs through Mysore and suppose the headworks of that river were in Mysore. Does it mean that the area comprising the headworks should be added to the Madras State or the area in the Madras State irrigated by that river should be added to the Mysore State? Can division be carried on like that and will such a division help to carry on administration in a just and proper manner? All these aspects should be taken into consideration. It is unfortunate that our Chief Minister did not and will not take all these aspects into

3-30
p.m.

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [17th July 1953]

consideration. He has some pet ideas, and being an old man it will be very difficult for him to give them up. For that, we have no quarrel with him. But he tries to impose those pet ideas on others by some means or other, and the Government amendment is a move in that direction. I will read the amendment which I have moved:—

‘ Add at the end of clause 3 the following:—

“(3) Boundary Commissions be set up on or within one month after the appointed day to re-demarcate the boundary between the States of Mysore and Andhra, especially the disputed areas in Adoni, Alur and Rayadurg taluks, Anantapur, Bellary, Tumkur, Kolar and Bangalore districts, and also the boundary between the States of Madras and Andhra, especially the disputed areas in Chingleput, North Arcot, Salem and Chittoor districts, the basis for such demarcation being the language and contiguity taking village as the lowest unit for the purpose of such demarcation.”

In this connexion, I want to make an appeal to our Kannadiga friends, particularly to the Hon. Dr. Nagan Gowda who is always good otherwise. It is unfortunate that in this matter he has taken up an undemocratic stand, i.e., he refuses to understand or consult the will of the people of the area. There is a disputed area, and everybody is agreed that it is a disputed area. Whether it should go to the Kannada State or the Andhra State should be settled by referring the question to a Boundary Commission or by holding a plebiscite. I am unable to understand how else it can be settled. The Hon. Dr. Nagan Gowda feels that since the last one hundred years, grave injustice is being meted out to Kannadigas in Bellary district. It is a bilingual and highly mixed area. When there are claims and counter-claims, how else can its future be settled except by accepting this reasonable proposition proposed in my amendment? The Hon. Chief Minister said that it was a settled matter, because an opinion or award had been given by Justice Misra. Because there is that award, we want that this House should express its opinion on it. We request all the Members to express the unanimous opinion that the future of this disputed area should be referred to a Boundary Commission, or by holding a plebiscite if need be. We do not stop with Bellary. We want the Boundary Commission to go into the other parts of the Andhra State, and the residuary Madras State. For instance, in Anantapur district, there may be Kannada villages or firkas, and these must naturally go to the Kannada State. The Communist Party does not desire the inclusion in the Andhra State of any area where the predominant language is other than Telugu. If a linguistic area is contiguous to a State of that language, it may be added to that State. If this view is accepted by all, we feel that this matter can be settled easily and without much discussion. It is unfortunate that this view is not acceptable. The Government have come forward with an amendment which divides not only the Members here but also the people outside. There is no justice in the amendment and we feel that there is great danger in accepting it. The Hon. Chief Minister said that the Boundary Commission was mainly intended for disputed areas. If Mr. Prakasam or Mr. Tenneti Viswanatham or some other Member brings pressure to bear on the Central Government about a particular area, will that area be referred to the Boundary Commission

17th July 1953] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

only afterwards? May I know from the Hon. Finance Minister the real intention behind the amendment? I do not accuse the Chief Minister of partiality. But all the same I say it is a part of his political game. He wants to placate certain parties and individuals and towards that end he sponsors amendments in so many ways. Even after the division of the Madras State, there will remain in the Residuary State certain Telugu areas contiguous to the Andhra State. It is better that those areas are transferred to the Andhra State. So also, the predominantly Tamil areas in the Andhra State in places like Chittoor which are contiguous to the Residuary State should be transferred to the Madras State. There are Telugu areas contiguous to the Andhra State in the Salem district. Nothing stands in the way of Sri C. Rajagopalachari from adding those areas to the Andhra State. He says that it may not be feasible and I think he is wrong. It is quite feasible. If this House expresses the opinion that the State of Madras should be divided properly on a linguistic basis, I am quite confident that the Central Government will yield. Our State is strong enough to bring pressure to bear upon the Central Government to divide the State in such a way that there will be no dispute. This is a very serious matter and we request the whole House to probe into it carefully. It is not such a simple thing as the Hon. Chief Minister thinks. He thinks that the matter can wait for some time. We have already witnessed many disturbances here and there.

"I would like to know the opinion of the Government as to when an area is said to be disputed. Does an area become disputed after disturbances commence or after filing a complaint in a court or whether a mere speech that such and such an area is disputed will do? The Hon. Chief Minister will blame the Communists or some others and escape from his responsibility. Mr. Muni Reddi, who represents the Hosur constituency, claims that the Hosur taluk should go to the Andhra State. Is this claim enough to constitute a dispute? What is the view of the present Madras Government and what is likely to be the view of the Government of the Residuary Madras State after the division of the State?

"All those issues are pending before us. Let us not brush aside those important issues. If we carefully follow the amendments given notice of by Members, we will see that most of the amendments are identical. Whether such areas are immediately attached to this or that State, let us not go into. Let us agree on the simple point that wherever there are disputes, and even in the case of Bellary and Chittoor districts, we should refer those disputes to a Boundary Commission. I would like to bring to the notice of the House two amendments, namely, amendment Nos. 21 and 44. Amendment No. 21 is given notice of by Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi and Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar. I will read out the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member need not read out the amendment."

[17th July 1953]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ I shall read it out just to make one thing clear. The amendment reads—

‘ Provided that the Government of India do take necessary steps to finally settle the boundaries of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore, Orissa, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh States, either by mutual agreement between the States concerned or by a Boundary Commission or Commissions and that the districts concerned may thereupon be reformed accordingly.’

The main thing here is to include a date in this amendment. Knowing the Central Government as we do all these years, we do not know when the Central Government are going to act upon this amendment and when they will appoint the Boundary Commission. This point must be made specific. Then only we can bring pressure upon the Government. The amendment that we like to support is that of Mr. N. Gopala Menon. His amendment reads—

‘ (3) All disputes among the States of Madras, Andhra and Mysore regarding the inclusion of a part of a district or territory in any one of the said States shall be referred to a Boundary Commission appointed for the purpose.’

I think the amendment given notice of by the Congress Party Members themselves are far more realistic and helpful to unify the people as a whole and to establish friendly relations which the Hon. the Chief Minister is cherishing. But, unfortunately the Government, instead of accepting the amendments given notice of by their own party Members—they are reasonable amendments—have themselves come forward with an amendment with a political motive to divide the people and the parties with a view to strengthening their own position. Or else, there is no meaning or purpose in the amendment which was given notice of by the Hon. the Leader of the House.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ It is for coming to the hon. Member's help.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ The Hon. the Finance Minister says that he is coming to our help. I do not know in what manner he is coming to help us. Most of the Members are saying that his help is not wanted, and that his amendment will harm every one. (Interruption.) The Hon. Mr. Subramaniam says that he is going to help. I do not know whom he is going to help. Even in Tamil Nad his amendment will not help anybody. There are parts of Tamilian population in Andhra State. Why should they remain there? That is the question. That is why I say so much upon this. I appeal to the Government once again to withdraw the Government amendment and support the amendments given notice of by Sri Gopala Menon and Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi if they have any prejudice towards the amendments given notice of by the Communist Party, however reasonable the Communist Party's amendments are. With these words, I appeal to the House to accept the amendments moved by the Communist Party or at least the amendments given notice of by Sri N. Gopala Menon and Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi, and definitely reject the amendment given notice of by the Hon. the Finance Minister.”

17th July 1953]

* **SRI K. VARADACHARI**:—"Sir, I have given notice of a cluster of amendments which seek, in the first instance, to prevent the handing over of a certain area in Bellary district to the Mysore State, until a plebiscite is taken in that area to get a clear affirmation or indication of the wishes of the majority of the people of that area. The second part of my amendments relates to the general question of fixing the boundaries of the three States concerned by means of Boundary Commissions which have to come up later on. I thought I should welcome the resolution given notice of by Government which is called a Government amendment. It should not have been called so. As a matter of fact, it is even out of order to call it a Government amendment and put it before the Assembly. Apart from that, I should have welcomed that resolution, if a Boundary Commission that is proposed in that resolution would mean that it applies only to those areas which are not yet transferred from one State to another. But what we find is that a most heart-rending episode has been enacted in Bellary through the agency of a judicial officer whose report is nicknamed or wrongly named as an award to-day. We are told by this so-called resolution of this Government that a Boundary Commission should come. It means that we have first to hand over the disputed area, then apply to a Boundary Commission, and then have it examined once again. This is a most illogical way of doing things in respect of an area which is still in the Madras State, and which is still to be awarded either to the Andhra State or the Mysore State, as the case may be, after a full investigation. If this difficulty were not there, I should certainly have accepted the Government amendment and welcomed it. (Interruption by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.) If it is on account of that difficulty, there should be no difficulty for the Government to add a proviso to this amendment, saying, 'provided that the territory now covered by Mr. Justice Misra's award is not to be handed over to the Mysore State pending the investigation by the Boundary Commission'. That has not been done. My friends who are protagonists for the six taluks of Chittoor district to be included in Tamil Nad were dissatisfied with the amendment, because it does not . . ."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"We are not dissatisfied."

* **SRI K. VARADACHARI**:—"Very well, Sir. I have heard Mr. Kosalram being dissatisfied about it. He did not support the Government amendment. He really repudiated the amendment. My friend cannot order me to mind myself and not mind others. If he does not interrupt me and keeps quiet for some time, he will be helping me."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member should not interrupt Mr. K. Varadachari."

* **SRI K. VARADACHARI**:—"Sir, I am addressing the Chair alone. (Laughter.) I am saying that my friend need not interrupt me again and again."

[17th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER:—" I will see that the hon. Member does not interrupt."

3-50 p.m. * SRI K. VARADACHARI—" I characterise the claim for six taluks in Chittoor district as a very wide claim, a claim so much wide of the mark that it perhaps fails of its purpose. The inner purpose of this claim, as everybody knows, is to get a substantial institution, called the Tirupati Devasthanam in Tirupati. It is on account of that that some of our friends in Tamil Nad are attracted to this idea. Unless they claim the six taluks in Chittoor district, the Tirupati Devasthanam cannot come into Tamil Nad. I can understand their anxiety and eagerness to get these six taluks, because it is such a big institution that it cannot be parted with after having enjoyed the benefit from it for so long a time in a composite State like Madras. I challenge any of my friends to go to Tirupati and find out if there are more than 38 Tamil families in Tirupati taluk. (Interruption by several hon. Members.) I cannot allow myself to be drowned by voices because I myself possess such a stentorian voice as to drown the voice of all the Members of the Assembly together. So, let my friends beware that they cannot interrupt me in this manner. I am saying I am not a native of Tirupati. Let my friends understand it. I am a native of Puttur taluk. I was brought up and educated in Tirupati in the lower classes and later on I came to Madras to have my high school study. Therefore, I know Tirupati very well. There are not more than 38 families, Ayyangar families chiefly, that reside in Tirupati. Their mother-tongue is no doubt Tamil, but they do not know how to read or write Tamil, and I am one of them. (Laughter.) My hon. Friend would rise and say that I am a contaminated Tamilian. Sir, I am not a contaminated Tamilian. In our days we never knew of any school in the Chittoor district in which Tamil was taught at all. It is now as a concession to the wishes of a minority people that our district board has introduced the Tamil language also as a medium of instruction in schools in places where Tamilians have been clamouring for it. Therefore, I submit that this claim of six taluks in the Chittoor district being Tamil taluks on the mere ground that they originally formed part of the North Arcot district and were divided later on, and that, therefore, they must be tacked on to the North Arcot district once more and made Tamil areas, is a claim which I cannot support at all.

" Sir, I represent the Tiruttani constituency. Tiruttani constituency, no doubt, has several villages on the border which are entirely Tamil and they ought to go into Tamil Nad whenever any Boundary Commission comes or even without a Boundary Commission. I concede that demand, but to say that the whole taluk is Tamil is again wide of the mark. I would draw a line on the Chittoor road from Vediangadu village up to Kanakamma-chatram. The villages south of this line are predominantly Tamil areas. I would never dispute that proposition. I gave the assurance to the people in that constituency that those areas which were predominantly Tamil would certainly go into Tamil Nad because they were contiguous to the Tamil territory. The rest of

17th July 1953]

[Sri K. Varadachari]

the taluk is absolutely Telugu and nobody can claim any portion of it simply because here and there amidst a dozen or a score of villages there may be Sengundar villages consisting of weavers. Sir, weavers are Sengundars and these weavers speak Tamil, but they adopt Telugu for their correspondence, business and study. Therefore, I submit this claim cannot be put forward and sustained. The hon. Member Sri Vinayakam, no doubt, during the time of the elections supported a Tamilian candidate, a very rich man, a Sengundar, who had thousands of relations in villages dispersed here and there in the constituencies. He tried his best to get that candidate elected. But I gave the simple assurance to all the people, whether they were Sengundars or not, that those areas which were contiguous to Tamil Nad and which were Tamil in character would go into Tamil Nad and that there would be no difficulty about that at all, but that the rest of the taluk was entirely Telugu and the claim for it could not be sustained at all.

“ Apart from all these things, with regard to Bellary, a very gruesome tale has come before us. A Judge was appointed and in the terms of reference, he was told that any minor realignments, if necessary and just, should also be recommended. That part of the reference, Mr. Justice Misra never touched at all. The first claim made by the Kannadigas was that the investigation should proceed on the basis that the taluk, as a whole, was a unit for investigation and not any firka or village. On that basis, Mr. Justice Misra began his investigation. There was a majority resolution of the Bellary Municipality and there were resolutions of all the panchayat boards in the disputed firkas of Bellary, with regard to this matter. Then, there were two sets of census figures presented before Mr. Justice Misra. One set of figures showed that the Kannadigas formed 53 per cent of the population and another set showed that they formed only 49 per cent. How these two sets of figures could be reconciled God alone knew. Yet, Mr. Justice Misra said that he did not attach much importance to the difference in figures. The resolutions of the panchayat boards were all brushed aside. Even the admission of the Kannadigas themselves that Bellary town contained preponderantly Telugu population was not taken into account. In fact, in one place in his report, Mr. Justice Misra says that this tide of Telugu infiltration into Bellary must be checked. If the situation was, as a fact, one in which the Telugus were predominant in the area either by infiltration or by invasion or by occupation, whatever it was, it was the situation he had to judge, and not the infiltration or occupation. He was called upon to find out which was the community that was preponderant in Bellary. The infiltration would not count. Mr. Justice Misra says that from the year 1782 this infiltration had gone on. If from that year infiltration had gone on and it had become a settled fact, then is Bellary going to be deprived of this infiltrated portion? Is it going to be said that the people who infiltrated should go out and the Kannadigas should be made a majority? Is that the way to look at the problem? But that is exactly the way in which Mr. Justice Misra looked at the problem.

[Sri K. Varadachari]

[17th July 1953]

"Then, Sir, it was brought to the notice of Mr. Justice Misra that the six taluks which had already been given away by the Government of India to the Mysore State were more a liability on than an asset to that State. It was also represented that if Bellary town was not given to them, the six taluks that were given to them would be a liability on them. Therefore, it was requested that in order to relieve them from the deficit, Bellary town should be given to them. That argument carried great weight with Mr. Justice Misra. He thought that, six taluks having been given to the Mysore State, that State should not suffer for want of income from that area and that it should not be made a liability on the Mysore State. Therefore, in order to compensate the Mysore State for the loss or the liability or the difficulty or the trouble involved in administering an area of that kind, Mr. Justice Misra gave the Bellary town to that State, thinking that it would relieve them a little.

4 p.m. "Thus the claim of the Kannadigas on the taluk basis was conceded and the whole taluk was given away to them. As a result of this, there will be a corridor of Telugu areas created between Bellary on the one hand and the taluks of Rayadrug, Adoni and Alur that have been given away to the Andhra State on the other. Bellary town contains several institutions started by the State. There is a Borstal school, there are jails, and the headquarters of the Deputy Inspector-General of Police is there. Thus several institutions are there. What was the difficulty in giving those institutions to the Andhras? Are the Andhras to be crumbled, clipped and cut into pieces before they are given the State in this manner? Madras City is taken away. Why should they take away Bellary also? Why should they take away the few buildings that are available in a place where the Madras State has spent lots of money on creating those institutions? The population in the jails according to Justice Misra runs to thousands, but the Kannadiga population in those jails runs to only hundreds. These are indications of the character of the area."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member's time is up."

* SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"Sir, the Andhras are a very civilised race. (Laughter.) Wherever they may be, they will prove to be a reforming influence. Even in jails they will be so. There may be criminals among them, but even then, they will be much better criminals than those coming from the rest of the country. (Laughter.) I submit these were indications for Justice Misra to come to the conclusion, 'Well, here is a place where the Madras State have spent lots of money on many institutions. So . . .'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member's time is over. Sri Gangayya Naidu will now speak."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"I rise on a point of personal explanation, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. Sri Varadachari was referring to me with reference to the election campaign. I want to clear a misapprehension that has been created in this

17th July 1953] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

House. Sri Varadachari who now pretends to be an Andhra in this House has issued pamphlets in the villages in his constituency mentioning that he was a born Tamilian, that he will fight for the Tamils in the event of an Andhra State coming into existence and fight for the retention of the area in Tamil Nad. That is the sort of pamphlet signed and issued by him to the villagers. I have literature with me. They are printed in Tamil and signed by him. With your permission, I am ready to produce them here."

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"I am game to his challenge."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Being a civilised Andhra, I know that he will accept my challenge. I will resign my seat in the Assembly. Let him also resign his membership in the Assembly from his constituency. Let both of us stand for election. I will stand as a Tamilian and let him stand as an Andhra. Let us see who wins the election." (Cheers.)

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"My friend Mr. Vinayakam is out as a wrestler. I am not a wrestler and I cannot accept absurd challenges."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"You are a civilised Andhra."

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"Yes, yes, very soon it will be known who is civilised. So many institutions have been established in Bellary."

(Hon. Member Sri Deivasigamany was seen standing in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order. Two hon. Members should not stand at the same time."

(Hon. Member Sri K. Varadachari resumed his seat.)

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"On a point of order, Sir. Is it parliamentary to offer challenges, accept challenges or refuse challenges?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not a challenge for a duel. It is only a verbal challenge." (Laughter.)

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"Sir, I was saying . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is it on a personal explanation that the hon. Member wishes to talk?"

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—No, Sir. I will continue my speech."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, no. Let the hon. Member resume his seat. Hon. Member Sri Gangayya Naidu will now speak."

SRI M. GANGAPPA:—"అధ్యక్షా, బెల్లారి విషయమై నేను కొన్ని మాటలు చెప్పదలచుకున్నాను. నేను మరికొంతమంది మిత్రులు కలిసి బెల్లారి లాల్సా రాకు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చవలసిన అవశ్యకతను గుర్తిస్తూ నైఋత్యగారికి సచ్చబెట్టే

[Sri M. Gangappa]

[17th July 1953]

విషయమై ఢిల్లీ వెళ్లినాము. అక్కడ వారితో అన్ని విషయములు చర్చించి ఒక మొమరాండంనుకూడా ఇచ్చినాము. వారితో జరిపిన చర్చల సందర్భంలో వారికి ముఖ్యమైన మూడు విషయములు మనవిజేశాను. బళ్లారి తాలూకాయొక్క ప్రత్యేక పరిస్థితులు, వైజానికంగా వాణిజ్యరీత్యా ఆ ప్రాంతం రాయలసీమలూనే కలిపేడడమే శ్రేయస్కరమనే విషయం వారికి నొక్కిచెప్పాము. ముఖ్యంగా మూడు విషయముల గురించి వారికి మనవిచేశాము. అవి ఇవి—బళ్లారికి ఒక జడ్జిని కుంపించి ఆయన చేత సమగ్రంగా ఆ ప్రాంత పరిస్థితులను, ప్రజల వాంఛలన్నీ పరిశీలించేయించి న్యాయమైన రీతిగా ఆ ప్రాంతాన్ని ఆంధ్రలో కలుపునట్లుగాచేయాలి; లేని పక్షంలో, ఆ ప్రాంత ప్రజలు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో ఉండగోరుతున్నారో, మైసూరు సంస్థానములో ఉండగోరుతున్నారో తెలుసుకొనే నిమిత్తం ప్రిలిమెంటు విర్వాటు చేయాలి; లేదా నేను నా శాసనసభాసభ్యత్వానికి రాజీనామాయించి ఆంధ్రుడనుగా ఆ స్థానానికి తిరిగి పోటీచేస్తాను. ఆ ఎన్నికలో నేను డెగ్గరల్లయితే, ప్రాంతాన్ని ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చమని, లేనిచో కర్నాటకప్రాంతంలో చేర్చవలెనని చెప్పినాను. నేను చెప్పినమాటలన్నీ విని వారు న్యాయం కలుగజేస్తామన్నారు. తరువాత నెనూగారు న్యాయమూర్తి శ్రీ మిత్రాగారిని పంపించారు. బళ్లారిలో శ్రీ మిత్రాగారికికూడా మేమంతా మొమరాండంలు సమర్పించాము. జనాభా లెక్కలను తయారు చేయటంలో ఆంధ్రులకు చాలా అన్యాయం జరిగినదని వారికి తెలియజేశాం. వాస్తవ విషయాలు తెలుసుకొనుటకుగాను వల్లెప్రాంతాలకువచ్చి వారంతటవారే ప్రజాభిప్రాయమేమో తెలుసుకొనవలసినదిగా వారికి విజ్ఞప్తిచేశాము. బళ్లారి తాలూకాలో ముఖ్యంగా బళ్లారి, రూపనగడి, మోక, ఫిర్కాలలోను, బళ్లారి పట్టణంలోను తెలుగువారి సంఖ్య అధికంగావుంది. కాబట్టి ఈ ప్రాంతాలు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేరాలి అని గట్టిగా వారికి చెప్పాము. మూడో వచ్చినట్లయితే గ్రామాలలోని ప్రజలు ఏమికావలెనని కోరుకుంటున్నారో వారు తెలుసుకుంటారు కనుక రమ్మన్నాము. వారు మొదటిలో ఆ విధంగా వస్తామనిచెప్పారు. కాని తరువాత అలాచేయలేదు. గ్రామాలను చూడకుండానే, ప్రజలు కోరుకుంటున్నదేమో గ్రహించకుండానే, తప్పుడు జనాభాలెక్కలను ఆధారంగాతీసుకొని బళ్లారి తాలూకా అంతా కర్నాటక రాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చవలెనని వారు తీర్పు ఇచ్చారు. ఈ తీర్పు ఆంధ్రులకు చాలా నష్టదాయకమైనది. మేము ఊరుకున్నా, ఆ ప్రాంతంలోని ప్రజలు ఊరుకొనరు. అందోళన జరుపుతారు. మైసూరు రాష్ట్రంలోచేరుటకు వారు ఎంతమాత్రం అంగీకరింపరు. కాబట్టి రూపనగడి, మోక, బళ్లారి ఫిర్కాలను బళ్లారి పట్టణంతోసహా ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చాలి. ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో ఆంధ్ర ప్రజలే ఎక్కువమంది ఉన్నారనే విషయంలో ఎవ్వరికైనాను సందేహమున్నట్లయితే అక్కడ ప్రిలిమెంటు విర్వాటు చేయండి అని మరల తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ప్రిలిమెంటులో ఆంధ్రులకు అనుకూలమైతే మమ్మలను ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చేయండి. లేక కర్నాటకులకు అనుకూలమైనట్లయితే, మేమందరిం మైసూరు సంస్థానంలో చేరుతాము. అంతే కాదు. ఈ ఫిర్కాలలో కర్నాటకులు, ఆంధ్రులే కాక మహమ్మదీయులకూడా చాలామంది ఉన్నారు. వారి రెండవ భాష తెలుగు అనే విషయం అందరకు తెలిసినటువంటిదే. ఈ సంగతిని వారందరు న్యాయమూర్తి మిత్రాగారికి తెలియజేశారు. అయినప్పటికీ ఆయన బళ్లారి తాలూకాను కర్నాటకులకే ఇచ్చివేయడం అన్యాయం. కాబట్టి ఇప్పుడైనా న్యాయాన్ని గుర్తించి, అక్టోబరు 1 వ తేదీలోగా అక్కడ ప్రిలిమెంటు విర్వాటుచేసి ప్రజాభిప్రాయమేమో గుర్తించి, తదనుగుణంగా రూపనగడి, మోక, బళ్లారి ఫిర్కాలను, బళ్లారి పట్టణాన్ని ఇటు ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రంలోనో, అటు మైసూరు సంస్థానంలోనో చేర్చించుటకు ప్రయత్నం చేయడం మంచిదనిచెప్పి ఇంతటితో ముగిస్తున్నాను.”

17th July 1953]

(At this stage Mr. Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI G. C. KONDAYYA :—“ ఉపాధ్యక్ష, బళ్లారి తాలూకానుగురించి 4-10 p.m.
మిశ్రాగారిచ్చిన తీర్పు ఒక award అని చెప్పి ఇదివరలో 4 రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు
పేర్కొన్నారు. అది సరికాదు. బళ్లారి సమస్యను సరిహద్దునిర్ణయక సంఘం
ద్వారాగాని, లేక స్టేబిలైజేషన్ ద్వారాగాని పరిష్కరించడము సబబైన పని. అంత
వరకు బళ్లారి తాలూకాను మైసూరు రాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చడం తప్పు. సరిహద్దు నిర్ణ
యక సంఘంవారి ద్వారాగాని, లేక స్టేబిలైజేషన్ ద్వారాగాని ఒక నిర్ణయం జరుగువరకు
బళ్లారి తాలూకాను ఇప్పటివరకే Residuary Madras State లోనే లేక ఆంధ్ర
రాష్ట్రంలోనే ఉంచడం న్యాయం. అంతేనే కాని ఇప్పుడే బళ్లారిని మైసూరులో
చేర్చి వేసినట్లయితే ఆంధ్రులకు చాలా అన్యాయం జరిగే ప్రమాదం ఉన్నది. ఈనాడు
బళ్లారిలో ఆందోళనగా ఉన్నది. ఆంధ్రప్రజలు తమ బిషివ్యత్తు అంధకార బంధురమై
పోతుండేమోనని బయటపడుతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వంవారు ప్రతిపాదించవన్న సవరణ
చాలా vague గా ఉంది. బళ్లారి విషయం వారి సవరణలోనికి వస్తుందో లేదో
వారే చెప్పలేకుండావున్నారు. ఈ ఉదయం 4 రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడుతూ
ఇదమిద్దమని ఏమాటా తేల్చలేకపోయారు. అసందిగ్ధంగా, స్పష్టంగా బళ్లారి
విషయం సవరణలో పేర్కొనక పోయినట్లయితే ఉత్తరోత్తరా సరిహద్దు నిర్ణాయక
సంఘం ఏర్పడుతుందో లేదో తెలియదు. అందువల్లనే ప్రభుత్వంవారిచ్చిన సవరణను
కొంతసవరించి సుస్పష్టంగా చేయవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. జనాభా లెక్కలు తప్పు
అని మిశ్రాగారికి ఆ ప్రాంత ప్రజలు తెలియజేశారు. అందునప్పటికీ ఆయన జనాభా
లెక్కలనే ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని ఈ నిర్ణయంచేశారు. తత్ఫలితంగానే ఈనాటివరకు
అక్కడ ఆందోళన సాగుతోంది. ప్రాయోగపత్రాలు జరుగుతున్నాయి. ప్రజలు
ఉద్రిక్తపడుతున్నారు. పరిస్థితులు చక్కబడాలంటే, ఆ ప్రాంతంలో ప్రజల అభీష్టం నేర
వేరాలంటేను Plebiscite ను ఏర్పాటుచేయడం అత్యవసరం, plebiscite ద్వారా
న్యాయం తప్పక జరుగగలదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని సుస్పష్టంచేస్తూ ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఒక
సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించడంగాని లేకపోతే మేముచేసిన సవరణను ఆమోదించడంగాని
అత్యవసరమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. Plebiscite జరిపి దానినిర్ణయానుగుణంగా బళ్లారిని
ఆయా రాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చడం అత్యవసరం. అంతవరకు బళ్లారి మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రం
లోనే ఉండాలి. మిశ్రా రిపోర్టు ప్రకారం దానిని మైసూరు స్టేటులో చేర్చినట్లయితే
బళ్లారి మనకు శాశ్వతంగాపోయే ప్రమాదమున్నది. ఈ విషయాన్ని కూడా గుర్తించి
ఆగ్టోబరు 1 వ తేదీకి ముందుగానే plebiscite జరిగేట్లు చూడవలసినదని ప్రభుత్వం
వారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను.

“ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో లేకుండా, రెసిడ్యుయరీ మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రంలో బళ్లారిని
వదిలితే తిరిగి అది మనకురాదని కొందరు అనుమానాలు ప్రకటిస్తున్నారు. కాని ఆ
అనుమానాలు చాలా అసంబద్ధంగా వున్నాయి. ఇంతవరకు బళ్లారి మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రం
లోనే వున్నది కాని మైసూరులోలేదు. ఇకముందు మనం బెండ్రీ కమిషను వారివద్ద
కోరబోయే నేలం జిల్లాలోని ప్రాంతాలు, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలు మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రంలోనే
ఉంటాయి కాని ప్రత్యేకంగా విమీశ్రంధవు. తమిళ ప్రాంతాలు అని కోరడం
చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోని ప్రాంతాలు బెండ్రీ కమిషనువారు నిర్ణయించేవరకు ఆంధ్ర
రాష్ట్రంలోనే వుంటాయి కాని వేరుగావుండవు. అలాగే బళ్లారి సమస్యకూడా,
వీలైనచో బళ్లారిని ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలోను, లేనియెడల రెసిడ్యుయరీ మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రం
లోనువుంచి, బెండ్రీ కమిషను ద్వారా పరిష్కరించబడేట్లుచూడాలి. ఈ విషయంలో
నాయకులు విదోషంగా రాజీపడడానికి వీలులేదు. అవిధంగా రాజీపడి ప్రస్తుతం

[Sri G. C. Kondayya]

[17th July 1953]

బళ్లారిని మైసూరులో సమన్వయపట్టయితే తరువాత పైబిసైటు జరిగినా, బొంబే కమిషనువచ్చినా, అంతా గందరగోళం అయిపోయి బళ్లారి తిరిగి ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలోకి రావడం సులభంకాకుండాపోతుంది. దురదృష్టవశాత్తు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం భాషారాష్ట్ర విభజనకు అనుసరించిన పద్ధతి చూచిపట్టయితే ఎవరైతే ప్రభుత్వానికి ఎక్కువ నష్టం కలిగిస్తారో వారి అందోళనకే లొంగేట్లా కనిపిస్తోంది. ఎవరు సక్రమమైన పద్ధతుల తమ హక్కులను సాధించాలి అనుకుంటారో వారికి అన్యాయంచేయడం పద్ధతిలోవుంది. చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోని తమిళ ప్రాంతాల విషయంలో రెండు, మూడు రోజులు తమిళులు రైల్వేస్టేషన్లకి అందోళన చేయడంతో నైఋత్య ప్రభుత్వం ఆ విషయాన్ని తప్పక సరిహద్దు నిర్ణయం సంఘానికి వదులుకోమని చెప్పారు. మిశ్రా అవార్డు వచ్చి నన్నుటినంచి బళ్లారి ఆంధ్రులు సత్కృతగా జరుపుతున్నారు. వందలకొద్ది విద్యార్థులు రైల్వేకు వంపబడ్డారు. ఒకాయన 27 రోజుల బట్టి ఉపవాసంచేస్తూ చావడానికి సిద్ధంగావున్నారు. ఈ సమస్య విషయంలో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం ఏమీ చెప్పలేదు. సరికదా, ఏమీ చెప్పారంటే, తిరిగి బళ్లారి ప్రస్తావన చేయరాదు. అది నిర్ణయమై పోయింది అన్నారు. ఈ సమస్య విషయంలో మన నాయకులందరు న్యాయమైన, సబబైన అభిప్రాయాన్ని ప్రకటించి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి న్యాయం జరిగేట్లా సలహా ఇవ్వాలి. అలాకాకుండా తరువాత ఎప్పుడో బొంబే కమిషనువస్తే వస్తుంది ఆనే దోరణిని అవలంబిస్తే, అసలు భాషారాష్ట్ర విభజనకే నష్టంచేసే తప్పుమార్గం చూపించడం అవుతుంది. ఈ విషయంలో మాత్రం తప్పకుండా అందరుగాడా ఐకమత్యంగా ఉండే, బళ్లారి సమస్యను న్యాయంగా పరిష్కరించబడేట్లా చూడవలసియ్యింది. అలాకాకుండా సరిహద్దుల సమస్య న్యాయంగా తేలకుండా రాష్ట్రాన్ని విచ్ఛిన్నం చేసిన సరిహద్దులలో చాలాగొడవలు రాగలవు. బళ్లారిని ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చి చిత్తూరు జిల్లా విషయంలో మాదిరిగానే బొంబే కమిషనును వేసినాకాని సమస్య పరిష్కారంకాదు. కనీసం బళ్లారిని ప్రస్తుతం మద్రాసులోవుంచి, తరువాత బొంబే కమిషనును వేసినా సరే, విర్పడే ఆంధ్ర సరిహద్దులు ఏవో తేలకుండా, గవర్నరు మెంటు ఆమెండు మెంటు అంగీకరించినా తరువాత ఏమి ఉపయోగంలేదని అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను."

4-20
p.m.

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI:—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I support the Government amendment for the inclusion of a clause in the Bill for the appointment of a boundary commission or commissions soon after the formation of the Andhra State to go into the question of adjusting the boundaries without mentioning, for the time being, any specific disputes referred to in this House. It is necessary that we should not include any disputes now to be referred to it because the number of disputes seems to be on the increase. Claims and counterclaims are being made and every day some agitation is being started in some part of the State in the border areas. It is becoming, therefore, increasingly difficult to make out clearly what belongs to this State and what belongs to the other. If we go through the Wanchoo Report we will find that the claims made before him have now undergone considerable change. They have increased in number. After his report was published, various demands were made. The various amendments that have been moved here also indicate that not only Members are interested in the formation of Andhra but they want to usher in Visalandhra also as early as possible. In that process the very declaration of the Government that a new Andhra State is going to be carved out of undisputed Telugu areas of the Madras

17th July 1953]

[Sri T. Anantha Pai]

State has to undergo considerable change. There are also certain amendments which want that the Kannada-speaking areas in the Madras State should be merged with Mysore and that some sort of settlement of boundaries should be effected. I do not know what exactly will be the scope of the boundary commission because the boundary commission will come into existence only to declare the boundaries of the Andhra State. If this boundary commission is to go into the question of the future readjustment of the several linguistic areas also, then the appointment of a high power committee that has been promised will not be necessary. But if we accept the proposition that the time has not yet come when we could go before a high power committee and represent our case for readjustment of boundaries, we can confine ourselves to the appointment of a boundary commission for fixing the boundaries of the Andhra State alone.

“Sir, one vexed question that has troubled our minds is the position of Bellary district. It is unfortunate that in the formation of the Andhra State, Bellary should assume such a great importance. If only the original proposition that seven taluks of Bellary district are predominantly Kannada-speaking and three taluks are Telugu-speaking was accepted, I am sure there would not be any chance for so much of bad blood and ill-feeling being created between the Andhras and the Kannadigas. I do not know who was responsible for the decision of the Central Government that only six taluks could go to Mysore and three taluks to Andhra and the fate of one taluk should hang in suspense. This is the decision that was responsible for all the mischief that is created. Feelings in Karnataka are as high as they are in Andhra. Many people have accused the Kannada legislators that they have given away the three taluks, which legitimately belong to Karnataka, to the Andhras unceremoniously. We have had to say that so long as the representatives of the people in the Assembly from these three taluks say that they should go to Andhra, we have nothing to say about it. In respect of the seven taluks, we thought that there was no dispute at all. Of course, we wanted the appointment of a boundary commission to go into the case of a few villages here and there in the taluks of Adoni, Alur and Rayadrug and even in Bellary. We did not mind it. But unfortunately, the decision of the Central Government to leave everything in suspense so far as Bellary was concerned, was responsible for all the agitation that was started subsequently. I would like to invite the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to this problem that is confronting us. For the last two days, Members from Andhra have been pressing the Chief Minister to make his mind clearly known on the issue of Bellary. He has been good enough to say that the question of Bellary and the question of Chittoor have been more or less the same, that he wanted that the Central Government should treat both in the same way but that the Centre did not agree and went ahead with the Misra enquiry. All this is known to everybody. But a section of the people has been made to feel that Rajaji has not defined very clearly the status of Bellary. They do not know whether Rajaji is really sorry that Bellary has

[Sri T. Anantha Pai]

[17th July 1953]

gone to Karnataka. We feel that so far as this question is concerned, Rajaji is entirely indifferent. Whether it belongs to Andhra or to Karnataka, it makes little difference to him. We want the position to be made clear. An agitation was started to force the hands of the Central Government to come to a decision then and there and Justice Misra was appointed to enquire into the question. If we do not like the verdict we can ask for something else. That is quite different. But to say that Bellary and Chittoor are more or less the same is not somehow very clear to me. For one thing, the problem of Chittoor was never at any time in suspense. It was included in the Telugu area. But at the same time, our Tamil friends wanted that the border adjustments should be made by a boundary commission. So far as Bellary goes, it was taken for granted that it was a Karnataka taluk and yet its fate was hanging in the balance. So the question of Bellary is entirely different from that of Chittoor. The question has assumed a different aspect altogether. So far as our Chief Minister and our Government are concerned, they are entirely indifferent to the verdict of Misra. I do not mind even if it were referred to a boundary commission for decision. But I do not want that it should go before a boundary commission at the instance of our Chief Minister. This is the only assurance I want to get from the present Government. So far as other matters are concerned, we only wish that even after the appointment of a boundary commission we should agree at a certain stage. Unless we do that, it would not be possible for us to carry on. When Justice Wanchoo came, did we not go to meet him at the station? Have we not read in papers that leader after leader saw him and tried to present his case as best as he could? Everyone was anxious that his report did not go against his interests. But once the report was published and once certain people found it was not in their favour, they did not like it. So also when Justice Misra came, so many individuals and parties happened to meet him and make representations. Everybody thought that his award would be in his favour. But the result was that one side accepted the award because it was in its favour and the other side did not agree with it.

4-30
p.m.

“Even after the Boundary Commission is appointed if the story were going to be like that, that either state, whichever, the state it is, is going to agitate until it is in its favour, I do not think it would be possible for any Government to function. At some stage or other we must agree. If we ask for the appointment of a Boundary Commission, I suppose, the decision of the Boundary Commission is entitled to some respect from us. I also say that the decision should be accepted by the people as a whole. Otherwise the whole thing would be reduced to farce.

“With these remarks I thank you for having given me this opportunity to support the amendment of the Government.”

* SRI K. KOTI REDDI:—“Sir, speaking on these amendments generally, I will first of all confine myself to the question of

17th July 1953] [Sri K. Koti Reddi]

the Bellary taluk, particularly the three firkas of Bellary, Rupana-gudi and Moka. There are a few aspects of this question which I want to place before this House. On the face of it the report of Mr. Justice Misra is not satisfactory at all. I do not know how the report was taken to be an award by some higher officials and even by some newspapers. The report itself has made it quite clear. The instructions that were given to Mr. Misra were clear. He was asked to investigate in as short a time as possible and report the matter to the Government of India. It is for the Government of India to come to their own decision on the facts presented by him. So it is not an award and it is only a decision of the Government of India. We have every right to say to the opinion, it is our duty to see that that wrong is set right. In the terms of reference to him, Government made it quite clear that not only the linguistic composition of the population is to be taken into consideration but also certain other factors. It said that the decision of the Bellary taluk question would be deferred in view of its mixed population as certain other matters would need consideration before coming to a decision. Mr. Justice Misra has no doubt touched on other aspects also like the economic well being of the people, their cultural affinity either with the Andhra people or the Mysore people. But finally his decision was mainly based on the linguistic composition. He has made this quite clear in his report. He said: 'The material to which reference has been made above fully corroborates the conclusions which I have reached on the basis of the census figures of 1951 and that is the sole object with which it has been referred in this report'. When people from these firkas represented that the census figures were not correct, they pointed to the fact that at the time when the last census was taken, very influential Kannada people like the President of the District Board influenced a good many of the teachers who were engaged on the preparation of the slips for the census report. This aspect of the complaint was not really taken into account. That was why people represented to him: 'You please go to some of the villages in the firkas mentioned and find out the position for yourself'. Even then they insisted examining only the three firkas in question. They also said: 'Even if you cannot visit all the villages, if you visit a few villages at least you are certain to be able to find out what is wrong with those figures'. He promised to do it in the beginning but on account of the agitation carried on on behalf of both the parties he refused to go and if he had done so, I am almost sure he would have come to the conclusion that there was something wrong in the census figures. Recently with regard to 1951 census in the border areas of Chittoor and Chingleput our Friend Mr. Vinayakam pointed out that there was something wrong in the census figures.

"It has often been said that the question of Bellary taluk has not been disputed for a very long time. It is no doubt true that as early as 1921, for the purpose of the Congress organization, a small committee was appointed for the first time presided over by the late Mr. Kelkar to go into this question. They gave a sort

[Sri K. Koti Reddi] [17th July 1953]

of award and said that so far as Bellary taluk was concerned it ought to go to the Kannadigas, that is, the Kannada State. At that very time one of the Members, Mr. Harisivothama Rao put in a minute of dissent. Even in that award, so far as I could remember, there is mention of the fact that this award is to stand only for a period of ten years and afterwards either of the party is at liberty to bring the question of Bellary for reconsideration before the authorities. It might be said that this reconsideration was not done. When we were agitating for the Andhra Province based mainly on linguistic considerations we hoped that one day or other a Boundary Commission would be appointed by the Government of India and that Commission would take into account the linguistic composition of the people of the taluk and other matters. The award of Mr. Kelkar was meant only for the purposes of Congress organization. It was not meant to be a permanent decision, and it is no wonder we waited for a future time for decision about the fate of the Bellary taluk.

4-40
p.m.

“Justice Misra clearly says that short of taking a plebiscite it won't be possible for deciding which way the majority of the people will decide, either in favour of one State or the other. He also says that in Bellary taluk most of the people speak both the languages—Telugu as well as Kanarese. That is why, Sir, we insist on taking a plebiscite in this matter.

“Plebiscite, Sir, as we know is one of the methods by which in the past the destinies of the people have been settled. During the Great War and immediately after the Great War, when the question of population of some of the German regions—Saar and Silesia, etc.—came up, it was decided that the destinies of the people after all should be decided by means of a plebiscite. At that time, at the Peace Conference there was a decision to take a plebiscite in nineteen cases. Ultimately, they gave up taking plebiscite and in as many as seven cases only plebiscite was taken. Plebiscite, Sir, is a method by which even today in some of the dominions and even in some of the States in America, the will of the people is ascertained. We all remember that in the States in the United States of America, people were given the choice to decide whether they would vote in favour of Prohibition or against it. Even today, the States individually have the option, the right to decide by means of a plebiscite whether they are in favour of Prohibition or not in their states. In Australia the question once came up whether they should introduce compulsion for military service or not and that question was decided by means of a plebiscite.

“So, not only matters of international importance, but also some matters of local importance which concern the population in a wider circle are sometimes decided in this way. Sir, I do not see, why in a matter of settling the destinies of the people—it may be in a small area or a big area—the wishes of the people should not be taken into account and a final decision taken in this way. I can say that as long as this question of the destinies of the people in

17th July 1953] [Sri K. Koti Reddi]

these disputed areas is decided by one person or for the matter of that even by a committee of three or five persons, there will always be discontent, due to differences of opinion. The best thing will be to give the option to the people themselves to decide their own destinies."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member has two minutes more."

SRI K. KOTI REDDI:—"Sir, in Bellary taluk itself something like 22 per cent or slightly more than that, are Muslims and others who are neither Kanarese nor Telugu people. Most of them speak both the languages but a few of them speak Kanarese. But on account of their long association, and connection with the Andhra area outside Bellary, the Telugu people in those areas are definitely hopeful that the Muslim and other population will certainly vote in favour of their joining the Andhra State."

"No doubt Mr. Justice Misra tried to find out the opinions of the Muslims. People went to his camp and saw him and spoke to him but without any definite idea as to whether they should vote in favour of Andhra State or Mysore State. It was not possible for him to come to any definite conclusion though no doubt the Muslims 'in Justice Misra's opinion' are equally divided. The method adopted to arrive at this decision is absolutely unsatisfactory. Language alone is not the consideration, but there are other considerations also. For making the decision to join either Mysore or Andhra, why should not these people be given the choice?"

"So, Sir, I insist that not only for making a decision in this respect but in all cases where this question of assigning the people of deciding the destinies of the people of any disputed areas comes up, the best thing will be to decide it by means of a plebiscite."

"In these democratic days, when we plead for Democracy, for parliamentary democracy, why should we not do it. I know particularly that our Prime Minister has and has very often said that he has great faith in the common man. Why should we not allow the common man to decide for himself whether he would join the Andhra State or the Mysore State?"

"Life is very precious. Of the two people concerned in fasting one of them has decided on fasting until death 'to bring to the notice of the authorities that they have in this case done a wrong' and that unless they are prepared to set it right he would not give up his fast. All that he has said is that the methods adopted in making this decision is wrong and incorrect and therefore to let the people who are concerned in this matter to make their own choice. He says, 'Please let me know whether you are prepared to have this question decided by means of a plebiscite and if so I will give up my fast.' I do not know really what is going to happen; but what he has said seems reasonable. It ought not to be very difficult for the Government of India to arrange for

[Sri K. Koti Reddi] [17th July 1953]

a plebiscite in a small area. There may arise bitter feeling; you cannot always avoid it. Are not passions roused in the matter of elections? When two candidates are contesting against each other, all sorts of things are said and even are put in writing and passions are roused. Have we given up elections on that account?

“My final appeal to the Government is that this really is a serious matter. In settling the destinies of the people, the best thing which will be satisfactory both to the Government and the people and all parties concerned will be to have a decision by means of a plebiscite.”

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU:—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take much time of this House, as almost all the subject has been covered by previous speakers. But I want to lay stress on one or two points. We do not understand the propriety and the precedence the Government of India followed in including Bellary district in the Mysore State. I want to quote one previous instance, viz., when the question of the formation of the Orissa State in 1936 was decided, some Telugu parts of Ganjam district and of Visakhapatnam district were included in the Orissa Province. In the O'Donnel Committee report—the Committee was appointed by the Central Government—it was stated ‘The whole of the area of Rishikulya Project, for administrative conveniences, should be included in the Orissa State.’

“But we the Andhras represented to the Central Government and the Indian National Congress the injustice done to the Andhras. In the O'Donnel Committee report it was also stated that the question would be reconsidered at the time of the formation of the Andhra State. What I wish to point out is that Mysore is not a linguistic State and that it is still a multi-lingual State. Therefore it is not just and proper to add the Bellary district, especially the Thungabhadra project area including the head works in the Mysore State. Yesterday it was pointed out by the Hon. Chief Minister that only linguistic considerations should not weigh, but the administrative difficulties and conveniences also should be taken into consideration as was pointed out by the Nehru Committee report. Therefore I request the Central Government to add the whole of the Thungabhadra Project area including the Head works in the Andhra State on grounds of administrative convenience. I would also suggest that the Bellary question may be considered at the time of the formation of a Kannada State.

4-50
p.m.

“Sir, this morning Mr. Latchanna and myself requested the Speaker to include our amendment (i.e.) amendment No. 260 seeking to include the Telugu areas in Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, in the list of amendments taken up for consideration, but the Hon. Speaker refused. The amendment relates to the Telugu areas in Orissa and Madhya Pradesh. I request the Chair that we may be given a chance to move that amendment when paragraph 19 is taken up. It was stated on behalf of the then Government and by the O'Donnel Committee that the whole of Jaipur Samasthanam that was taken away from the old Visakhapatnam district which

17th July 1953] [P. Pundarikakshacharyalu]

is now called Koraput district, parts of Berhampur, Parlakimedi and Gunupur would be taken up for consideration when the Andhra State is formed at the earliest opportunity. Sir, I need not dilate much on the subject that the above areas are completely Telugu. There was a dispute before the then Working Committee of the Indian National Congress in regard to the formation of Congress Committees in those areas and it was decided likewise and also ultimately that Andhras also can send delegates from those areas. It will be in the fitness of things if the boundaries between the Andhra and Orissa and Andhra and Madhya Pradesh are also settled simultaneously with the formation of the Andhra State. I therefore want the Chief Minister to clarify that the Boundary Commission that is envisaged by the Government of India should decide the boundaries of Andhra State with Orissa and Madhya Pradesh also. With these few words, Sir, I conclude."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to support my amendment as also the amendments moved by my hon. Friends Mr. G. C. Kondayya, Mr. Ramiah Choudary, Mr. P. Pundarikakshacharyulu, Mr. T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi and Mr. N. Gopala Menon. I oppose the amendment moved by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam on behalf of the Government. The Hon. Chief Minister has pointed out that my amendment which gives a picture of Visala Andhra, is out of place. When a company is floated, it will be called Messrs. Parry and Company, etc., and not the Company of All-India. But Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said that we were going to have an Andhra State within the territory of Madras. But in the title to the Bill, they did not call it Andhra State (Madras). Sir, our discussion is confined to Andhra State, Central Government and other States. So far as Andhra State is concerned, we shall no doubt discuss it threadbare and in that connection my proposal to include all Telugu-speaking areas in Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Hyderabad and Mysore is not out of order.

"Sir, when we think of the decision on Bellary taluk, it is like hanging a man and allowing him to appeal. We are asking the Bellary people to wait till the Boundary Commission comes. But according to the statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru all the Telugu-speaking areas should be constituted into one State within Madras. Now, the three firkas of Bellary, Rupanagudi and Moka are given away to Mysore. But who decided it? Mr. Justice Misra himself said in his report in paragraph (9), 'The material supplied to me by those who appeared before me was vague and inconclusive. Short of conducting a plebiscite it was impossible to decide which way the majority support lay.' I do not say that plebiscite is an international affair. But I do concede that it is an international affair. But at the time of deciding the boundaries between India and Pakistan in regard to Sylhet district, the Radcliffe Award recommended plebiscite. Here also it can be decided

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [17th July 1953]

by a plebiscite. Even Mr. Justice Wanchoo said in his report (pages 5), 'that the matter could be easily settled by taking population firka-wise.' The demand of Bellary people is that the division should be firka-wise, or else it should be decided by a plebiscite as in the case of Sylhet district in Bengal. It can be said that plebiscite cannot be conducted now. I concede that too because of the shortness of time at our disposal before the inauguration of Andhra State. Therefore I say that these three firkas should be retained in the Andhra State for the present and their future decided afterwards by a plebiscite.

5 p.m.

"Of course the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam may say that he had already given notice of a comprehensive resolution for the appointment of one or two boundary commissions in the disputed areas. But if we are to carefully scrutinise the wording in the resolution the Andhras cannot miss noticing that the very purport of that resolution will result in the diminishing rather than increasing the territory of the Andhra State. Why have they not mentioned Bellary? The Hon. Chief Minister, Sri Rajaji, says we are not concerned with Bellary. Its fate had already been decided. Of course people like him may not be concerned with anything that might happen in the world. But we cannot remain so. This same thing even Pandit Nehru was saying before the formation of the Andhra State. He said that he would not be too much concerned with the fast of Potti Sriramulu. But every Indian knows that but for Potti Sriramulu's sacrifice Andhra State would not have come into being. News of the announcement of the Andhra State came only after his death. That fact should not be forgotten. We have to take stock of the agitation of the people. As I had observed previously Andhras are an emotional type of people. Their cherished goal is not the present small Andhra State but 'Visala Andhra' comprising the Telugu areas of Orissa, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Mysore. Let us all remember that fact and not try to brush it aside.

"There is something behind the Andhra claim over some parts of Orissa. Let me explain. What happened when the Simon Commission came? We Andhras took part in the national boycott. The Commission in their turn said that they would teach us a lesson. They took some portion of ours and gave it to Orissa. So it is that we find the Telugu area in Orissa. This is O'Donnell report. I suppose it would be quite crystal clear now how forcibly Telugu territory had been annexed in Orissa. When such is the case, is it any wonder that the Andhras when they are about to have their own State want their brethren in Orissa also should join them? Can it be said that such a claim is strange? Can it be brushed aside easily as untenable, when history shows that our claim is quite legitimate?

"Let me now come to Bellary. I suppose all hon. Members are well aware of what had happened there. What did the Central Government do? They appointed a Judge to decide the issue. Can one man decide the issue? Who is the competent Judge? Is it not

17th July 1953] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

democratic that a plebiscite ought to have been held there to ascertain public opinion? Was it done? No, nothing of that sort. The Hon. Chief Minister says that a plebiscite is an international affair. When such is the case, what is it that they did after Radcliff award? What did they do with regard to Sylhet? How was the future of Sylhet determined? Was it not by a plebiscite? When they did so with regard to Sylhet, why did they shrink from repeating the same in Bellary? Some people bring in the Kelkar award in the midst. We must understand the circumstances that led to the Kelkar award? What did Mr. Kelkar do? Because the dispute arose between the Karnatak and Andhra Congress Committees at that time as to their jurisdiction over Bellary which is bi-lingual, Mr. Kelkar had to come on behalf of the All-India Congress Committee. Can that issue be clubbed with the report of Misra, which was concerned with the *integration* of the Bellary taluk either with Andhra or Mysore?

“Let me explain correctly the Misra report itself. People say this and that. Some say we cannot run counter to a Judge's findings. I am not opposing for the sake of argument. Is paragraph 6 of his report, Mr. Misra himself says that the literature supplied to him was very *vague* (note the words) and *short of a plebiscite* (I want hon. Members to carefully note the words) the only conclusion to which he could come with regard to the three firkas of Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi was that they could best be integrated with Mysore. ‘Short of a plebiscite’ that is what Mr. Misra himself says. Therefore what I say is let us first of all hold a plebiscite in these three taluks and then decide their future. Let us accept the verdict of the people and not of one man. Why should we feel shy of holding a plebiscite? Let the Central Government as well as the Provincial Government take note of this. If they do not care for our words this Hon. Chief Minister and the Prime Minister would be committing a grave blunder. Let the unanimous wish of the people be given due respect. That is the lesson of democracy.

“As I had observed (let me repeat it again once, twice or even ten times) the cherished goal of Andhras is Visala Andhra. After a long and bitter struggle we are now going to have a small Andhra State out of the composite Madras State. It is but natural that we want to develop our State with all amenities possible in the agricultural, economic and financial fields. Is it then any strange thing that we want to increase our mineral potential by adding the Telangana and Bastar areas. After all they are our own areas and our own brethren are living there. Then what is wrong in our claiming all of them in ‘Visala Andhra’, I ask.

“With these words I support the amendment given notice of by Sri Pundarikakshacharyulu and others claiming a plebiscite in Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi firkas to decide their future.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Discussion on the amendments may close today. The Hon. Minister will reply to-morrow and vote may be taken after he had spoken.”

[17th July 1953]

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM**:—"Sir, it may not be possible for all of us to finish our speeches today itself. We became aware of the Government amendment only today morning, Sir. Moreover we want some time to arrive at an agreed formula regarding this clause because after all this clause and the division of assets and liabilities clause are the only two clauses that are very important. Therefore I would request you Mr. Speaker to allow us some time to-morrow. The Hon. Leader of the House may then reply and then the vote may be taken."

MR. SPEAKER:—"What does the Hon. Leader of the House say?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"If the Opposition were to present an agreed formula there need not be any discussion because it is an agreed one. Only if there are differences of views there need be any discussion. So the discussion can be finished to-day. The Hon. Minister can reply to-morrow and the vote may be taken afterwards."

5-10
p.m. * **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI**:—"The only comment that occurs to me is that if the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham does not speak to-day and consultations would be going on but the result of their consultations or the drift of their consultations are not made known till to-morrow at the time of the debate and if Sri Viswanatham is to speak to-morrow how really, I wish to ask, Sir, do they expect the Government to make up their mind? Therefore, Sir, it would be much better if the matter is discussed today fully only providing for any necessary explanation tomorrow morning and the reply taking place and the vote being taken. I shall further explain, Sir, the point is this: People's mind change quickly and it is not constant as some people may hope now and then. I have heard Member after Member rising and speaking and I am afraid that the effort of the Government to provide a formula which would be satisfactory to all is not likely to succeed. That is the impression that I have after hearing the speeches of various Members. Member after Member sitting behind Sri Viswanatham was eager each to press his own amendment. Left to myself, Sir, I do not put it officially, my psychological inclination is to let things take their own course and to withdraw the amendment proposed by the Government because the object of the effort is not to be gained."

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM**:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think the Government require much time to accept an agreed formula. I have no dilatory purpose in what I am suggesting. We wanted a Boundary Commission now and whether any amendment can be evolved covering all the view points and satisfactory to all is a thing upon which we must consult each other because you know, Sir, and the Chief Minister knows that the composition of the House is such that we cannot straightaway say: All right I will agree to this or that amendment. Therefore it is, Sir, that we require a little time. Of course the Leader of the House or the Hon. the Chief Minister will not require much time either to accept

17th July 1953]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

an agreed formula or reject it. I do not think much time will be wasted and a good purpose will be served by taking it up tomorrow. This is a very important portion of the Bill and except with regard to the section relating to assets and liabilities, others are not very important. All that we are anxious is that as the Chief Minister has also seen the necessity for a Boundary Commission the recommendation with regard to the Boundary Commission going from this House should be unanimous. That is my object, Sir."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"My complaint is that the appeal has not made any impression; I was only able to convince my old colleague. Nobody else was convinced."

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must say that even the old colleague and friend of Sri Rajagopalachari was shaken very greatly when certain clarifications were sought for and the answers were given by the Chief Minister. This is an attempt that is being made by the Prime Minister to form the Andhra State comprising all the Telugu-speaking areas and my hon. Friend Sri Latchanna asked for certain clarification whether the Telugu areas of Orissa will also come under the Government amendment and the answer was that they will not come under the scope of the amendment. My point is if they do not come even now when the Andhra State is being formed, when will it come? Perhaps it will never come. Anyone who knows anything of these areas knows how people there have been suffering and are unable to find any relief with regard to the matter. People there, friends of those areas presented a memorandum to Mr. Wanchoo and he received them and told them that they might be considered at the time the proposals took shape. The Hon. the Chief Minister was telling that his inclination was to withdraw the Government amendment. If he is compelled because there is no support for it, then he will have to withdraw. What Sri Viswanatham has been telling from the very beginning is that all these amendments required careful examination. The amendments were given only this morning and there was not enough time to consider their implications; it was the subject of discussion by Member after Member and they also tried to get certain clarification with regard to certain matters and when they did not get the clarification, they began to say that they oppose those amendments. That is not the way in which a Government which has been good enough to move an amendment concerning the Boundary Commission, should try to go back upon it. What is wanted by Sri Viswanatham is time to examine them very closely and find out whether there is any way of coming to a common agreement after discussion. On our side we have been considering the amendment in its various aspects and also the alternatives and also what would be the effect of the Government now saying that they would withdraw the amendments. Nothing would be lost by the discussion continuing tomorrow morning so that we may be able to consider overnight whether we are right or wrong. I appeal to him not to be in a hurry and say 'I will withdraw the Government amendments'. Withdrawal is a matter of

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[17th July 1953]

everyday occurrence on so many matters and that is not the attitude in which we should approach this question. I myself felt that the Andhras of Orissa would not be covered by this amendment and it is a serious matter for us because we have to tell the people something by way of securing their just demands for inclusion in the Andhra State. Regarding Bellary also, Sir, valuable contributions have been made in the House and mention has also been made of what Sri Misra himself stated with regard to the possibility of solving that problem; he seems to have suggested nothing short of a plebiscite would enable anyone to solve the question. Should not such a question be given the greatest amount of consideration? After the passage was read out by Sri Gopalakrishnaiah there should be no doubt in the matter. Therefore, Sir, this question also should be considered within ourselves and it is necessary for you also to consider it.

5-20
p.m.

“ A plebiscite is a very legitimate thing and chapter and verse have been quoted by my hon. Friend, Sri Koti Reddi, in such a splendid manner as to convince everybody how to solve a problem of this nature. What sufferings had been gone through in Bellary ! During the general discussion, in the course of my speech, I failed to refer to one incident, viz., the lathi charges on the people of Bellary. Extra police, not the Police Force of Bellary, was sent from different parts of the State to that area. I do not say the Government of Madras acted without some information. The information they had was a Press report that there was looting and plundering in the streets of Bellary. The Collector of the district sent a report that the whole thing was false. On this, the agitation was continued and a demand was made on the part of the people that there should be an enquiry. There was no enquiry held anywhere and all these things have happened. Even Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Deputy Prime Minister of India, did not look into the language used by Justice Misra himself when he said that Misra's Award was final and it would not be reopened. He was perhaps led away by the report that there was plundering and looting in the streets and public places of Bellary. If such things had happened there should have been an enquiry. There has, however, been not even a thought of an enquiry. This is not the way in which matters of such importance should be judged. I too got telegrams that there was one man who was preparing himself for a fast. Pandit Jawaharlal and our Chief Minister, Sri Rajagopalachari, say that it is a foolish thing to fast and die but there are still people in this world who are prepared to follow the doctrine of Mahatma Gandhi.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ The doctrine of fasting ! ”

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—“ Yes, the doctrine of fasting. Sri Rajagopalachari says that he even advised Mahatma Gandhi not to fast. He must have advised him privately. But, he was also one of those who gathered along with ourselves and the people of India at Poona to save Mahatma Gandhi from his fast unto death to get

17th July 1953]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

some relief from Premier Macdonald of Britain. We all succeeded and fortunately Mahatma Gandhi did not die on that occasion. Sir, this is how our country is suffering in a thousand and one ways. I would therefore request my hon. Friend to allow this matter to be put off for further consideration."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, may I waste a little more of the time of the House. After hearing Sri T. Prakasam any slight hope that I had had ended in regard to this matter. He wanted clarification and I placed my cards on the table perfectly clearly. He must understand once again that this amendment which the Government have proposed cannot possibly in law or in any other way include Orissa and those other things. That is quite clear. If, therefore, my advice was accepted by Sri Prakasam on a wrong understanding of it, it is for him to withdraw the agreement at the time and he has done it in a speech which has covered very many facts besides what are quite relevant to the occasion. Therefore, if the House is in a mood and if you, Sir, are also in a mood to put it off till to morrow hoping that a miracle would happen, I have no objection."

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"Sir, I am sorry to learn that I entered into an agreement with my hon. Friend, Sri C. Rajagopalachari. Sir, you called upon me after the Government motion was moved and I then and there stated my own views on the matter. There was no agreement saying that the whole thing would be accepted by me before any examination especially when my Friend, Sri Viswanatham, had already stated that time must be given to examine this amendment. I should not therefore be charged with having entered into any agreement. There was no time for me to think of an agreement on a matter of this nature especially when I am concerned with so many incidents regarding these affairs."

* SRI L. LAKSHMAN DAS:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, today I have just moved an amendment which is very important and I think the whole House would agree with me. But, unfortunately, Sri C. Rajagopalachari did not agree that Orissa should be included in this. I must therefore remind the House that the places which I have mentioned in my amendment were once in the Madras State and were included in the Orissa State some 17 years ago much against the will of the Madras Government. I will now read my amendment for consideration by this Hon. House—

'This House recommends to the Government of India to make a provision in the Bill for the early appointment of a Boundary Commission to determine all Telugu-speaking areas of Parlakimedi, Berhampore, Gunupur and Jeypore of Orissa State and Bustar of Madhya Pradesh State which are on the northern boundaries of the Andhra State.'

Except Bustar of Madhya Pradesh the other places formed part of the Madras Presidency for a long period of nearly a hundred years and more. But, unfortunately during the regime of the British Government these places were torn away from the Madras State much against the will of the Madras Government. There are records to show that the Madras Government protested against

[Sri L. Lakshman Das]

[17th July 1953]

the inclusion of these places in Orissa. Not only this, the Chairman of the Orissa Boundary Commission, Mr. O'denell, has appended a minute of dissent which clearly shows the injustice that has been done to the Andhra people in these parts. Mr. O'denell has stated—

'More than half the total population is Telugu by race and Telugu is the mother-tongue of nearly two-thirds and the subsidiary language of 45,000 persons. If Parlakimedi is added to the Province of Orissa sooner or later, and probably before very long, an agitation will arise inside and outside the State for its reunion with the Telugu Districts, which will embitter the relations between the Oriyas and Telugus. In setting the boundaries of the New Province, the line should be so drawn as to leave, so far as possible, no minority problem. The boundary which I propose gives to Orissa all the areas in which the Oriya population predominates.'

How prophetic these words are ! Mr. Atlee, one of the members of the Joint Select Committee, and who assisted the Secretary of State for India on the Boundary question, has also stated in the report of the Joint Select Committee as follows:—

'We have great sympathy with the desire of the Raja of Parlakimedi for the inclusion of his Estate in the New Province, but in the view of the racial and linguistic composition of the population therein contained, we are unable to recommend that his desire should be acceded to.'

All these show the injustice that has been done to the Andhras in these areas.

5-30
p.m.

"As a matter of fact, it should be the duty of the Government of Madras to get all those parts even before the new Andhra State is formed. The Government of Madras ought to have tried their level best to get all those parts from the Orissa State. The Members of this Legislature also have got a responsibility in this matter. Therefore, I request once again the Prime Minister of India as also the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari to consider the problem of Orissa Andhras. We know how the Andhras in Orissa are put to all sorts of difficulties. In the absence of representatives of Orissa here, I do not wish to say anything more on the subject. However I wish to narrate an incident that took place in Berhampur. No less a person than Dr. Pattabhi Seetharamiah when he visited Berhampur was ill-treated and stoned. I am unable to express in adequate language the difficulties of the Andhras in Orissa State. Hitherto they were hoping that all Telugu-speaking areas in Orissa State would be included in the new Andhra State at the time of its formation. Even in the J.V.P. Committee's report, it has been contemplated that all Telugu-speaking areas in Orissa should be considered for inclusion in the new Andhra State at the time of its formation. Even the Dhar Committee has made similar recommendations. The Oriyas also claim some portions of Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts. They also want that a Boundary Commission should go into this matter. The Government must take into consideration all these factors. This is the time, as Mr. Prakasam stated, to ask the Central Government to appoint a Boundary Commission to go into all these matters. There are about 10 lakhs of Telugus living in Orissa. The whole of 40 lakhs of Telugu people living in Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam districts would rather prefer to remain with the ten lakhs of Telugus in Orissa than be in the new Andhra State without them.

17th July 1953] [Sri L. Lakshman Das]

So far as my amendment is concerned there is no difference of opinion at all in this House. Every one should show their sympathy and goodwill for the Andhras by expressing their support for my amendment as the cause was not an unjust one. We, Andhras, do not want any land which is not ours. But we do not wish to tolerate if our land is taken by anybody. There is no controversy at all over this issue. Nobody can say anything against my amendment. It is the duty of this Madras Government to get all those parts in Orissa State which belonged to them once. They should at least request the Government of India to appoint a Boundary Commission so that those parts may be included in the new Andhra State. Unless and until the ten lakhs of Andhras living in Orissa State are given relief there will always be trouble in the northern parts of the State. I once again specially request Sri Rajagopalachari to think over this issue very carefully and give full consideration for the matter so that justice may be rendered to the ten lakhs of Andhras now living in Orissa. I thank you Sir, for the opportunity you have given to me."

* SRI P. M. MUNUSWAMY GOUNDAR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to speak a few words on the amendments now under discussion before the House. After the dream of Swaraj was realised, the dream of the Andhra Brethren is being fulfilled. We, Tamilians, are very happy about it, and we wish the new State a successful career.

"Regarding the appointment of Boundary Commissions to inquire into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas, I wish to submit that the wishes of those areas also in this matter should be ascertained before Boundary Commissions are finally appointed. As representative of Uddanapalli constituency, I desire to state that vast majority of people in my area wish to remain in the residuary State itself, and any other alternative does not appeal to them. The areas in my constituency, particularly Hosur and Krishnagiri taluks, are situated in one corner of the State and the people there do not wish that their areas should go to the Andhra State. I do not admit the statements made by Mr. Prakasam and others that these taluks are populated by Telugus and Kannadigas alone. The members and the Presidents of Hosur, Barigai, Denkanikota, Kelamangalam and Veppanapalli Panchayat Boards have sent resolutions and a number of memoranda to the Government stating that these taluks should not be attached to the Andhra State. If at all the people of Hosur taluk want to leave the residuary state, they are particularly interested in joining with the Mysore State and not with the Andhra State because they have got all kinds of facilities to go to the Mysore State. Majority of the people in that taluk are non-Andhras. Many of the statements stated by Sri T. Prakasam, Sri T. Thimma Reddi and others in this connexion are wrong and I cannot admit. With these words, I conclude."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"I would like to speak at least for half an hour, Sir, and as the time available now is short, may I have permission to speak to-morrow?"

[17th July 1953]

Mr. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member can speak now. If he has got anything more to speak, he can continue his speech to-morrow.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ ఈ లిప్తానంతైన మాయొక్క సందేశాన్ని ప్రకటించవలసి వచ్చింది. అంటే ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క దృష్టినిగాని దోరణినిగాని మేము విమీ విమర్శించాలి అనే ఉద్దేశం ఎంతమాత్రంలేదు. ప్రభుత్వం సరిహద్దు నిర్ణాయక సంఘం నియామకం విషయములో ఎంతవరకు తాము చెప్పగలరో, తమకు జూరిస్ డిక్షను ఎంతవరకు వుండో ఆ విషయం చర్చించుకుని తమకు తోచిన విధంగా ఈ ఎమెండుమెంటును ఇచ్చారు. ఇప్పుడు లక్షణదానుగారు చెప్పినట్లుగా, జిరిస్సా సరిహద్దులోవుండి ఒకప్పుడు మద్రాసు రాష్ట్ర ప్రాంతాలుగావుండే ఆంధ్ర ప్రాంతాలు విషయము ప్రస్తుతం మన మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము మరచిపోవడం మాత్రం చాలా విచార కరమైన విషయమని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఇందులో ఉన్నటువంటి పదాలు, ‘ the President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiry into the disputes that have arisen in certain border areas’—certain border areas గరించి విచారణ చేయాలి అని vague గా విడిచిపెట్టే దానికంటే border areas అన్నింటినీకూడా విచారణ చెయ్యాలి అని విశాల దృక్పథం ప్రదర్శించి వున్నట్లుంటే చాలా ధర్మంగా వుండేది, సబబుగా వుండేది, చట్ట సమ్మతంగా వుండేది అని మనవిచేస్తున్నాం. అట్లా చెయ్యడం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము వారి ప్రకటనలకు వ్యతిరేకం అవుతుందని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నారు. ఇది మా దురదృష్టము అని చెప్పవలసివున్నది. ఏ సూత్రాల ననుసరించి ప్రభుత్వము వారు శాసనసభకు ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించినారో, ఆ సూత్రాల ననుసరించే అంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర నిర్మాణ సందర్భములో ఇండియా ప్రభుత్వం ఏర్పాటుచేయనున్న సరిహద్దు నిర్ణాయక సంఘం ప్రస్తుత అంధ్రరాష్ట్ర సరిహద్దులలోవుండే disputed contiguous areas విషయంకూడా పరిశీలించాలి అని ప్రకటించాలి. మేము అంధ్రరాష్ట్ర సరిహద్దులకు విమీ సంబంధములేని ప్రాంతాలు గరించి కోరడంలేదు. అంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర సరిహద్దులలో contiguous గా నుండే ప్రాంతాల విషయమే పరిశీలన జరగాలి అని కోరుతున్నాము. పది లక్షల జనాభా గలిగిన అంధ్ర ప్రాంతం జిరిస్సా సరిహద్దులలో వుండడవల్ల అంధ్రరాష్ట్ర సరిహద్దులలో వుండే ఆ ప్రాంతం గురించే మేము కోరుతున్నాం. అటు కంటకు ప్రాంతంలోగాని నాగపూరులోగాని pockets గా వుండే ప్రాంతాలు గురించి మేము కోరడంలేదు. ఆ ప్రాంతాలు బొంబే కమిషనువారు పరిశీలించాలి అని అనడంలేదు. న్యాయంగా అంధ్ర ప్రాంతాలుగావుండి అంధ్ర సరిహద్దులకు అనుకునివుండే ప్రాంతాల గురించే మేము బొంబే కమిషను పరిశీలనకు ఏర్పాటుచేయాలి అని కోరుతున్నాము. ఈ రోజున ఈ విధంగా బళ్లారి ప్రాంతం disputed ప్రాంతంగా అయితే, మన ప్రభుత్వం ఇదమిద్దంగా తమ అభిప్రాయాన్ని చెప్పలేక పోతోంది అని విచారించవలసి వస్తోంది.

5.4 U P.m. “ ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రతిపాదించినటువంటి సవరణను గనుక యథాతథంగా ఒప్పుకొన్నట్లైతే, ఈ సమస్యకు సంబంధించినటువంటి ఇతర సవరణలన్నీకూడా ఆ సవరణలను ప్రతిపాదించినవారు తమంతట తామే ఉపసంహరించుకొన్నట్లు documentary గా రుజువు అయ్యే పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడుతుంది. ఇది ఎంతమాత్రం కూడ ఒప్పుకోతగినది కాదు. ఎక్కడెక్కడ ఏ సమస్యైతే, తీవ్రమైన వాగ్వాదాలకు పరస్పర విద్వేషాలకు, పరస్పర సంఘర్షణలకు దారితీస్తున్నవో అటువంటి సమస్యలను సాధ్యమైనంత త్వరలో స్పష్టంగా పరిష్కారము చేసుకోవడం మంచిది. ఇటువంటి సమస్యలను పరిష్కరించడములో ఏ ప్రభుత్వముగాని, ప్రజలందరూ అంగీకరించునటువంటి అందరికి

17th July 1953] [Sri G. Latchanna]

సమీపంగా ఉండేటటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక పద్ధతిని అనుసరించవలసి యుంటుంది. అప్పుడే ప్రజలలో శాంతి ఏర్పడగలదు. అట్లుగాకుండా, వాస్తవంగా వివిధ ప్రాంతాలలో భిన్న సమస్యలన్నీ గమనించకుండా, ఏదో ఒక ప్రాంతానికి సంబంధించిన సమస్యను మాత్రము పరిష్కారం చేద్దాము, మిగిలిన ప్రాంతాల సమస్యలు తరువాత విచారించు దాము అనే వద్దతి సరియైంది కాదు. ఎక్కడైతే, ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క చట్టముల, ఉత్తర్వులు ఉల్లంఘించబడుతున్నాయో, ఎక్కడైతే ప్రజలు ప్రభుత్వపు చట్టాలను ప్రతిఘటించి వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారో అటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలోనే సమస్యలున్నవనీ, అటువంటి ఉల్లంఘనలు ప్రదర్శనలు లేనిచోట సమస్యలు లేవనె వ్యవస్థం ఇతర చోట్లకూడ ప్రజలను అటువంటి ఆరాచక చర్యలకు ప్రదర్శనాలకు పురిగొల్పి ప్రజలలో ఆశాంతిని రెచ్చగొట్టేటటువంటి విధానములైతే ఉంటుంటే విధానములలో శాంతి భద్రతలకు భంగము రాకుండాఉండే విలాపి ప్రజాస్వామిక సూత్రముగాని, దూరదృష్టిగాని లేదని, అటు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమునకును, ఇటు మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వమునకును మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. అందులో ఉండే ప్రమాదాన్ని గురించి వారిని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ప్రాంతీయ సరిహద్దుల సమస్య అనేది చాలా తీవ్రమైన సమస్య. ఈ సమస్యను గురించి బళ్లారిలో సర్వోగ్రహం జరుగుచున్నది. ఆ సమస్యను వెంటనే పరిష్కరించవలసియున్నదంటే, దానికి సమాధానంగా, కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఈ విషయాన్ని విచారించేందుకు ఒక జజ్జిని పంపించారు. వారు విచారించి ఒక రిపోర్టు ఇచ్చారు, ఆ రిపోర్టు ప్రకారం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం తీర్పు ఇవ్వడం జరిగింది, దానికి మేము ఏమిచేసేదీ అని చెప్పడం, ఒకవిధమైనటువంటి రొంగ సమాధానమని అనిపించుకొంటుండేగాని మరేమిగాని ఒక్కో సమస్యను విచారించినటువంటి మిశ్రాగారి తీర్పుకు తిరుగులేదనిగూడ, అక్కడ ఢిల్లీలో ఉన్న పెద్దలైతే నేమి, మరి రాజకీయ పార్టీ పెద్దలైతే నేమి, చెప్పతున్నారు. అయితే ఇదే సందర్భంలోనే వాంచూగారి సిఫార్సులను అంగీకరించినటువంటి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము మిశ్రాగారి తీర్పును అవార్డుగా చెప్పడములో ఒక వాతీకదృష్టిని అవలంబిస్తున్నదని ప్రజలు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని సందేహిస్తున్నారు. ప్రజలను ఈ విషయములో నిందించడానికి వీలులేదు. ఎందుకనగా, వాంచూగారి రిపోర్టు recommendatory గా, ఒక సిఫార్సుగా భావించినప్పుడు, మిశ్రాగారి రిపోర్టు గూడా, అదేవిధంగా భావించవలెను, గాని, అది అవార్డు కాజాలదు, కానేరదు. ఎవరుకూడ దానిని అమలు పరచ జాలరు. దీనిని ప్రజలు అంగీకరించలేరు అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఏ సమస్యను గురించి అయితే ప్రజలు, ప్లెబిస్సో పెట్టండి. ఉప ఎన్నికలు పెట్టండి. ప్రజాభిప్రాయం వివిధంగా వస్తుందో చూడండి అని సవాలు చేస్తున్నారో, ఆ సమస్యను ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విధంగా తృణీకరించడము సరియైంది కాదు. అసలు, ఎవరి తీర్పు అయితే అవార్డు అని చెప్పతున్నారో, అటువంటి మిశ్రాగారి నివేదికలోనే ఆ ప్రాంతముయొక్క census figures చాలా తప్పుగా ఉన్నాయని సంఖ్యలు పరస్పర విరుద్ధంగా ఉన్నాయని రుజువుచేసారనీ ఎవరైనా అంగీకరింపక తప్పదు. అందువల్ల అక్కడ ఉన్న census report చాలా తప్పుని చెప్పినటువంటి మిశ్రాగారి రిపోర్టును అవార్డుగా తీసుకోవడము ఏ మాత్రం సబబుగాలేదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఏ సమస్యనైన పరిష్కరించే విషయములో ప్రజల అభిప్రాయాన్ని తీసుకొని, ఎవరికి అంగీకార యోగ్యంగా ఉండేటటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానములో విచారణజరిపి ఆ విధంగా తీర్పు ఇచ్చినప్పుడే, అది ప్రజల స్వయంత్రత కట్టి, దానిని శాంతి ప్రదంగా అందరు అంగీకరింప కలుగుతారు. అప్పుడే ప్రజలలో శాంతి భద్రతలు ఏర్పడతాయి. అప్పుడే, ఆయా ప్రాంతాలయొక్క అభివృద్ధి పురోగమనం ఏర్పడుతుంది. అంతేగాని, బలవంతంగా, మాకు అధికారము ఉన్నదని చెప్పి ఫలానా

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[17th July 1953]

తీర్పు ఇచ్చాము. దానికి తిరుగు లేదని చెప్పడం సరియైంది కాదు. ఏ పెద్దలుగూడ శాశ్వతంగా ఉండజూరు అనే సంగతి మరువరాదు. బ్రిటిషువారియొక్క గత చరిత్ర దీనిని రుజువు చేస్తున్నది. చిర కాలముగా సుస్థిరముగా విర్వడినటువంటి బ్రిటిషు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ప్రతిఘటించినవారుకూడా గతించిపోయారు అనే సంగతి మరువరాదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. అందుచేత, ప్రజలయొక్క హృదయాన్ని తెలుసుకొని ఎక్కడెక్కడ వియే తగాదా లున్నవో, వాటినిగురించి ఆయా ప్రజల అభిప్రాయాన్ని వారి హృదయాన్ని తెలుసుకొని ఆ విధంగా వాటిని పరిష్కరించడం మంచిది. అయితే తెలుగు ప్రాంతాలకు సంబంధించినటువంటివి మాత్రం తీసుకొనవలసిందని, తక్కిన వాటిని తీసుకో సవసరింలేదని, ఆంధ్రులలో, ఏ వ్యక్తి అయినా సరే చెప్పడం లేదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మన సోదరుడు వినాయగం శివేంద్రులుగా ఒక కొత్త రాష్ట్రం విర్వడితున్నప్పుడు ఎక్కడైనా సరే సరిహద్దు తగాదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు దానికి సంబంధించినవారు, తమిళ సోదరులుగాని, తెలుగువారిగాని, ఒరిస్సా సోదరులుగాని, వాటినిగురించి ఫిర్యాదు ఏదైనా చేస్తే, వాటిని ఎంత త్వరగా ప్రజాస్వామిక పద్ధతిలో పరిష్కారం చేస్తే అంత మంచిది. అప్పుడే, ప్రజలలో శాంతి విర్వడ గలదు. అప్పుడే, శాంతి ధ్రువతలను శాశ్వతంగా, సుస్థిరంగా, సక్రమంగా కాపాడుకోవడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. అంతేగాని ఉన్న సమస్యను మరుగుపరచి, దాని విషయం ఇప్పుడేమీ తొందరలేదు, తరువాత ఆలోచిద్దాం అని చెప్పడం సరియైంది కాదు. పొట్టి శ్రీరాములు ఆత్మ బలదానం అయిన తరువాతగూడా, ఇంకా ఆ విధానాన్ని ఆవలంబించడం చాలా ప్రమాదకరమని తెలుపుతున్నాను. బల్లారి సమస్య గురించి, అక్కడ రామి రెడ్డిగారు చాలా రోజులుగా ఉపవాసం చేస్తున్నారంటే, అక్కడి పరిస్థితులు ఎంత ప్రమాదంగా ఉన్నవో, ప్రజల ఆ వేదన ఎంత తీవ్రంగా ఉన్నదో, ఆ ప్రజలకే సరిగా తెలుసుకుని, తక్కినవారికి సరిగా తెలియక పోవచ్చు. కనుక పరిస్థితులు మరి విషమించక పూర్వమే, ఆ సమస్యను న్యాయంగా పరిష్కరించవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. చేయి జారకముందే, వ్యవహారాన్ని చక్క బెట్టుకొనుట మంచిది. దీపము ఉన్నప్పుడే ఇల్లు చక్క బెట్టుకోవలసిన గాని దీపము ఆరిపోయిన తరువాత చేసుట తడుపుకొని ప్రయోజనం లేదు. కనుక ఇటువంటి సమస్యలను మరుగుపరచడం ప్రజలలో తీవ్ర ఉద్దేశాలకు, పరస్పర విద్వేషాలకు దారి తీస్తుంది. ఈ విధానం, సరియైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానం కాదని, దూర దృష్టి కలిగినటువంటి విప్రభుత్వంగాని చేయవలసినటువంటి కర్తవ్యంగాని, అవలంబించవలసినటువంటి విధానంగాని కాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. కనుక, ఎక్కడెక్కడ వియే సరిహద్దు సమస్య లున్నాయో, వాటిని టీకీ Boundary Committees వేసి న్యాయంగా పరిశీలించి దాని ప్రకారం పరిష్కరించినట్లయితే, ఏ భాషకు చెందిన వారైనా సరే, అందరికీ విశ్వాసప్రాయానికి రావడానికి ఏలాటి అభ్యంతరం ఉండగూడదు. ప్రభుత్వం ఈ విధంగా చేస్తుందని ఆశించాం గాని, ఇప్పుడు వారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణబట్టి చూస్తే, అటువంటి నిర్ణయాలు చేయడానికి సరియైన అవకాశం లేకుండా ఉండేరికా ఆ పదజాలము ఉన్నది. ఈ సవరణ ఎవరికీని సమాధానంగాను, న్యాయ సమ్మతంగాను లేదని ప్రభుత్వానికి సవినయంగా మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కాని, ఇప్పటికైన మించిపోయింది లేదు. ఈ ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర నిర్మాణం విషయంలో, ఎక్కడెక్కడ సరిహద్దు తగాదాలున్నవో, అక్కడి పరిస్థితులు పరిణామ రూపాన్ని దాల్చకముందే, వెన్సెంటునే తగాదాలను న్యాయ సమ్మతంగా పరిష్కరించుటకు, సరిహద్దు నిర్ణయ సంఘాల నియామకంచేసి, వాటిని సాధ్యమైనంత త్వరలో పరిష్కరించినట్లయితే ఆయా ప్రాంతాలలో శాంతి ధ్రువతలకు ధంగం కలుగకుండా ఉండేందుకు అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. ప్రజాప్రభుత్వం అనుపించు

17th July 1953]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

కొనేవారు, అధికారంతో ఉన్నటువంటివారు, ఇటువంటి సమస్యలను ప్రజావిప్రాయానుగుణంగా, న్యాయంగా, పరిష్కరించవలసియున్నది. అంతేగాని అభివృద్ధి నిరోధక విధానాన్ని అవలంబించనూడదని, అటువంటి విధానం దూరదృష్టి లేనటువంటి విధానమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అందుచేత ప్రజల శాంతికి భంగము, రాకుండా ఉండేటట్లు, ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించే విషయంలో ఒక న్యాయమైన అందరికీ అంగీకార యోగ్యముగా ఉండేటువంటి విధానాన్ని అవలంబించవలెనని గుసవిచేస్తున్నాను.

“అందుచేత శాంతి భద్రతలకు భంగము రాకుండా ఒక భాషా ప్రాంతాల వారికి మరొక భాషా ప్రాంతాలవారికి మధ్య భాషా విభేదాలు, విద్వేషాలు హెచ్చిపోకుండా వారి వారి సరిహద్దు సమస్యలు శాంతి మార్గాన పరిష్కారము చేస్తే, అది ఎప్పటికీ గూడా మంచి పద్ధతి, సరియైన పద్ధతి అని అంటున్నాను. అందువల్ల నేను యీ రోజున కోరేది ఏమిటంటే, మన దేశములో ఏ ఏ భాషా ప్రాంతాలలో ఏ ఏ గ్రామాలలో, స్థిరాల్పలో ఏ ఏ భాషలు, భున్నవో ఆయా భాషలపై ప్రాంతాలు ఆయా రాష్ట్రములో కలిపివేయటానికి అవకాశం కలిగించాలి గాని, ఒక భాషా ప్రాంతాన్ని మరొక భాషా ప్రాంతంలో ఏదో విధంగా కలిపివేయడమనేది మంచి పద్ధతి కాదని నా అభిప్రాయము. ద్విభాషా ప్రాంతములుగా భున్నచంగల్వట్టు మొదలయిన ప్రదేశాలను మేము ఆంధ్రము కోరటముకాదు. మారుమూల ప్రాంతాలు కావాలి, మధుర కావాలి, చంగల్వలు కావాలి, అది కావాలి, ఇది కావాలి అనే ఆశ్రయ వాదాలు మేము చేయడము లేదు. న్యాయముగా తెలుగుభాష భున్నచోట్లనే కోరుతున్నాము. భాషల విషయములో తగాదాలు భున్నచోట్ల కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం సరియైన విచారణచేసి స్వేచ్ఛ పద్ధతిని వ్యవహరించాలియున్నాను. అంతే కాకుండా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం ఆనుసరించే policies లో ప్రజలలో అనుమానాలు, భుదేశాలు పెరగటానికి తావు యివ్వకుండా ఎంత త్వరలో యీ తగాదాలు పరిష్కారము చేస్తే అంత మంచిది. అప్పుడే దేశములో శాంతి భద్రతలు సాధించి భుదేశాలను అరికట్టగలిగి పట్టభుతుంది. భాషా ప్రయత్న రాష్ట్ర స్థాపన విషయములో సరిహద్దు నిర్ణయములలో రోజు రోజుకు ప్రజలలో ఉద్రేకాలు పెరిగిపోతున్నది. అందుకునూ ప్రభుత్వం వెంటనే యీ తగాదాలు పరిష్కరించవలసియున్నది. ఈ తగాదాలు పరిష్కరించాలంటే కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం వెంటనే ఒక సరిహద్దు నిర్ణాయక సంఘాన్ని ఏర్పాటు చేయాలి. అటువంటి సంఘము ఏర్పాటు చేసి సరిహద్దులు నిర్ణయించకపోతే దేశములో శాంతి భద్రతలు భుండవు. దేశం అల్లకల్లోలంలోకి వస్తుంది. తగాదాలు పరిష్కారములో కాలయాపన చేయకుండా, ద్వేషాలు భుదేశాలు రెచ్చిపోవడం అరికట్టడానికి ప్రయత్నించాలి. కాబట్టి యీ భాషా ప్రయత్న రాష్ట్ర స్థాపనలో సరిహద్దులు నిర్ణాయక సంఘముద్వారా క్రమ పద్ధతిని నిర్ణయించేందుకు సరిహద్దు పరిష్కారము కావాలేగాని వేరు మార్గములేదు. ఇందుకునూ ప్రభుత్వం తెచ్చిన సవరణను సరియైన విధంగా సవరించి, శాసన సభ్యులందరు యావత్తుంది ఏకగ్రీవంగా ఆమోదించి, మన దక్షిణ భారత దేశంలో మొదటి భాషా రాష్ట్రముగా ఏర్పడబోతున్న ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర స్థాపనకు రోహద మివ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర స్థాపనలో స్వేచ్ఛ పద్ధతినే సరియైన మార్గాలు ఆసన్నించి ముగిసిన ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రములో నెలకొల్పటకు మార్గ చర్యకుమగా నాయకత్వం వహించి సహాయ పడవలసిందిగా ముఖ్యంగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారి గారిని కోరుతూ యంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

5-50
r.m.

[17th July 1953]

* SRI T. MALLAYYA :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఇంతకు ముందు చాలమంది సభ్యులు బళ్లారి తాలూకా విషయము తమకు తోచినరీతిగా మాట్లాడారు. బళ్లారి జిల్లా నుంచి వస్తూ వున్న నేను, యీ విషయములో మాట్లాడాలని ఎంతో తాపత్రయంతో ఉండి ఉండగా నాకు మీరు అవకాశం యిచ్చారు. అందుకుగాను మీకు నేను నా కృతజ్ఞతను తెలుపుతున్నాను. బళ్లారి తాలూకా ఒకటే కాకుండా, బళ్లారి జిల్లాలో యావత్తు ప్రదేశాలు కూడా ద్విభాషాప్రాంతమని మీరు గమనించాలని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. అక్కడ కన్నడీలు తెలుగువారు కూడా వున్నారు. అందులో తూర్పు తాలూకాలు అయినటువంటివి ఆలూరు, ఆదోని, రాయదుర్గం అనే ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయించింది. ఆ ప్రకారం తెలుగువారు అక్కడ అధికసంఖ్యాకులుగానే వున్నారు. ఈ తాలూకాలు మాత్రం ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చడం జరిగింది. తర్వాత పట్టణమైన డిన్న మిగతా ఆరు తాలూకాలు కూడా ఒక దిశగా చేర్చారు. పోతే బళ్లారి తాలూకా విషయంలో మాత్రం చాలా వేరులు బయలుదేరాయి. ఈ వేరులు పరిష్కరించడానికి ఒక మాన్యువల్ రావటానికి కేంద్రప్రభుత్వం జస్టిసు మిశ్రాగారిని పంపించింది. అందుమీదట జస్టిసు మిశ్రాగారు రావటం జరిగింది. కాని, బళ్లారి తాలూకా విషయం విపులంగా enquiry జరుగుతుందని మే మంతా ఆశించాము. మిశ్రాగారు వచ్చి బళ్లారి జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ఆఫీసులో కూర్చుని యెవరో కొంతమంది ప్రజలవద్ద నుంచి ఏవో కొన్ని మెమోరాండములు వున్నవనిన్నారు. మిశ్రాగారు బళ్లారి తాలూకాను కన్నడ రాష్ట్రమైన మైసూరు రాష్ట్రానికి కట్టిపెట్టాలనే దురుద్దేశ్యముతో బళ్లారిని గురించిన వివరాలు సరిగా పరిశీలించక, ఏవో కొన్ని points మనస్సులో పెట్టుకొని, చూచా యిగా enquiry చేసినట్లు చేసి మైసూరు రాష్ట్రానికి కట్టబెట్టే నిర్ణయించేసి వెళ్లారు. ఈ నిర్ణయంపట్ల మాకు ఎంతో నిరుత్సాహం వలిగింది. ఆ నాడు మిశ్రాగారి నిర్ణయం వల్ల బళ్లారి తాలూకాలో డిన్న ఆంధ్రులకు న్యాయం జరగలేదనినీ, యీ నాడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చిన amendment చూలానైనా ఆంధ్రులకు సోదైన న్యాయం తప్పక జరుగుతుందనే ఆశతో నేను మాట్లాడుతున్నాను. బళ్లారి పట్టణములో మిశ్రా ఒప్పుకున్నట్లు ఆంధ్రులు ఆత్యధిక సంఖ్యాకులుగా ఉన్నారు. కన్నడీలు కూడా అధిక సంఖ్యాకులుగా వున్నారు. వీరికి మించినవారు ముస్లింలు, మరి ఇతరజాతులు వున్నారు. బళ్లారి పట్టణము సుమారు డైబ్ల్యువేల జనాభాగల పట్టణము. ఇది చాల అభివృద్ధి చెందిన పట్టణము. ఈ పట్టణం నిజంగా ఏ ప్రాంతానికి పోవాలి, అనే విషయంపై నిర్ణయించేస్తూ జస్టిసు మిశ్రా వ్యక్తిగతంగా ప్రాసెసింగ్ పనిచేరానిది. కాబట్టి అక్కడ వున్నటువంటి ప్రజామోదానికి సరియైనరీతిగా plebiscite జరగడం చాలా ముఖ్యమని మనచిచేస్తున్నాను. Plebiscite అంటే బళ్లారి భవిష్యత్తు ప్రజలే నిర్ణయించుకోవడ మన్న మాట. ఇక పోతే బళ్లారి పట్టణానికి తూర్పున వున్న అన్ని గ్రామాలలో కూడా ఆంధ్రులే ఆత్యధిక సంఖ్యాకులుగా వున్నారని మేము మిశ్రాతో వాదించాము. మిశ్రాగారు ఆ విషయం గమనించలేదు. మిశ్రాగారు ఆ గ్రామాల నుండి వచ్చిన జనము, వారియొక్క తాపత్రయము, గండరగోళముదూచి, మిశ్రాగారు బళ్లారి విడిచిపోలేదు. మిశ్రాగారిని ఆ గ్రామాలకు వెళ్లి ఆంధ్రులసంఖ్య విషయం దర్యాప్తుచేయమని కోరినప్పటికీ, యీ గండరగోళంలో నేను పోదలమకోలేదని చెప్పి విపులముగా దర్యాప్తు చేయటానికి నిరాకరించాడు. ఆంధ్రప్రజల వేదనలు, గండర గోళము సాగుతో పూరివివరాలకొరకు గ్రామాలకు వెళ్లి అయినను నేకరించలేదు. ఇలా వుండి మిశ్రాగారి పర్యటన, ఆత్యధిక సంఖ్యాకుల వివరాలు పరిశీలించకుండా నివేదిక ప్రాయడం, చివరికి అన్యాయముగా బళ్లారిని మైసూరుకు కట్టిపెట్టడం జరిగినది. మిశ్రాగారికి బళ్లారి తాలూకాలోని గ్రామాలకు వెళ్లి ఆంధ్రప్రజల జనాభా లెక్కలు దర్యాప్తు చేయటానికి వీలుపడక రోయిందిగాని, వారు మైసూరు వెళ్లి అక్కడ మూడు

17th July 1953]

[Sri T. Mallayya]

రోజులు కూర్చుని మైసూరు ముఖ్యమంత్రితో గుస గుసలు చెప్పి ఆంధ్రులకు బళ్లారిని లేకుండా అన్యాయం చేయటానికి మాత్రం వీలుఅయింది అంటున్నాను. ఇదేనా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం మిత్రాగారిని పంపినందుకు చేయవలసిన న్యాయపరిశీలన, తీర్పు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. మిత్రాగారు బళ్లారిలో చేసిన కార్యక్రమం అంతా చూస్తే ఆంధ్రులను ఏదో ఒక రకంగా మభ్యపరచి అన్యాయంచేయటానికి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం మిత్రాను పంపించి, ఏదో ఒక రిపోర్టు తయారుచేయించి తెప్పించుకొని, ఆ మరు రుణంలోనే బళ్లారి విషయమై మిత్రాగారు యిచ్చిన రిపోర్టును ఆధారంచేసికొని బళ్లారిని మైసూరు రాష్ట్రంలో చేర్చుటకు ఆమోదించాము అని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం ప్రకటించింది. ఇంత త్వరలోనే, తగిన పరిశీలన చేయకుండా, కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం బళ్లారిని మైసూరులో చేర్చామనటంతో యిందులో ఎదో ఒక కుట్ర గూడు పురాణము ఉన్నదని చెప్పక తప్పదు. మిత్రాచేసిన తీర్పు అన్యాయమని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి ఎన్ని మొరలు పెట్టుకుంటున్నప్పటికీ ప్రయోజనము కనబడటములేదు. ఈ విషయములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం ఆంధ్రులను బళ్లారి నుంచి దూరముచేయడం దురన్యాయ మంటున్నాను. అంతచేత ప్రస్తుతము నేను కోరేది యేమిటంటే, నాకు తెలిసి సంతమట్టుకు బళ్లారి, మోక, రూపనగుడి, యివన్నియు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రములోకి రావలసినవేగాని, మరొకటికాదు. ఈ ప్రదేశాలలో ఆంధ్రులు ఆత్యధిక సంఖ్యా లుగా వున్నారు కాబట్టి, యీ ప్రాంతాలు బళ్లారి తాలూకాకు చెందినవి కాబట్టి, యీ ప్రాంతము అంతయు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రములో చేర్చాలని నొక్కి వక్కాణించుచున్నాను. అక్కడ ఆంధ్రుల జనాభా కన్నడీలకంటే ఎక్కువైననే సంగతి నిర్వివాదాంశము. ఈ విషయం కాదని ఎవరు చెప్పలేరు. ఈ ప్రాంతానికి చెందిన ఆంధ్రులకు న్యాయము జరగాలంటే, plebiscite పెట్టించండి. నిజము బయట పడుతుంది. అంతేకాని అక్రమ తీర్పులవల్ల ప్రయోజనము లేదు. Plebiscite వల్ల ఎన్నటికీని నిజము బయట పడగలదు. Plebiscite వల్ల వ్యక్తిగతంగా చేసిన అన్యాయపు తీర్పులు పరిశీలించి రుజువు కాగలవు. అక్కడ వున్నటువంటి కన్నడీలు, ఆంధ్రులు, వారి వారి జనాభాలను బట్టి, వారి బలాబలాను వారే plebiscite ద్వారా నిర్ణయించుకోగలరని అంటున్నాను. బళ్లారి, బళ్లారి తాలూకాలో వైన వేర్వేరుబడిన గ్రామాలలో ఆంధ్రుల జనాభా గాని, కన్నడీల జనాభాగాని, ఎవరు ఆత్యధిక సంఖ్యాకులలో తేలుతుంది. కాబట్టి యిప్పటికే మించిపోలేదు. బళ్లారి ఆంధ్రులకు న్యాయంచేయాలంటే అక్కడ శాసనసభ్యులందరు ఒక తీర్మానం ద్వారా plebiscite కొరకు కృషిచేసి న్యాయం జరిగించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. అట్లు చేయకపోతే, వారికి అన్యాయమే జరుగుతుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. మోక, రూపనగుడి మాట ఆటుండనియ్యండి. ఇప్పటికి ఎన్నో సంవత్సరాల నుంచి బళ్లారి జిల్లాలో వ్యవహారములన్నియు తెలుగులోనే జరుపబడుచున్నాయి. తమిళులు ఉన్నా, వ్యవహారములు తెలుగులోనే నడపబడుచున్నాయి. జిల్లా మొత్తంమీద ఎక్కడదూచినా యిప్పటికీ కూడా యిది కన్నడప్రాంతమని చెప్పి ఎవరూ నిరూపించలేదు. ఈ జిల్లాలో వున్న శిరిగుప్ప తాలూకాలు ప్రజలు మాట్లాడేది కన్నడము అయినప్పటికీ వ్యవహారాలు జరిగేది మాత్రం తెలుగులోనే జరుగుచున్నవి. ఇప్పటికిని ప్రాతకోతలు తెలుగేకాని కన్నడము కాదు. పల్లికు రికార్డులు అన్ని గూడా తెలుగులోనే జరుగుచున్నవి. ఈవిషయం మేము నిరూపించాలంటే, తెలుగు, కన్నడము ఒకేస్థాయిలో జరుగుతున్నాయని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. కాబట్టి ఇప్పుడు ఆ తాలూకాను గురించి మేము పేటికెత్తడము లేదు. బళ్లారినిగురించే మేము యీనాటికిగాని, ఎప్పటికిగాని పోరాడేదని నిరూపింపంగా చెబుతున్నాను. అక్కడ వుండే ఆంధ్రులు బళ్లారిని మాత్రం విడువరని గుర్తించాలి. ఈ బళ్లారి తాలూకానుగురించి నిర్ణయం చేసేముందు plebiscite పెట్టడం మంచిదని చెబుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”